New Series *Volume X, Number 38* *May 1959*

The Review of English Studies

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
JUN 1 1959
PERIODICAL READING ROOM

A Quarterly Journal of English Literature and the English Language

Editors: PETER ALEXANDER, NORMAN DAVIS
Assistant Editor: JEAN ROBERTSON

CONTENTS

'The Green Count' and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. By S. R. T. O. d'Ardenne 113
The Quarto Copy for the Folio *Richard III*. By J. K. Walton 127
What was the Soul of the Apple? By W. A. Murray . . 141
Clarissa Restored? By M. Kinkead-Weekes . . . 156

NOTES

An Unpublished Middle English Prologue (June Cooling) . 172
Spenser's *Prothalamion*: a New Genre (J. Norton Smith) . 173
'Love' in *King Lear* (Terry Hawkes) 178
A Source for *The Revenger's Tragedy* (G. K. Hunter) . . 181
A Housman 'Reminiscence' (John Sparrow) . . . 183

(*Continued at foot of next page*)

OXFORD · AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net: Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; R. W. CHAPMAN; H. B. CHARLTON; SIR IFOR EVANS; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The University, Glasgow, W. 2. MSS. cannot be returned unless postage is enclosed. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC.

Syntax und Semantik der modalen Hilfsverben im Altenglischen, by Ewald Standop, 186; Middle English Dictionary, edited by Hans Kurath with Sherman M. Kuhn, 187; The Medieval Alexander, by George Cary, edited by D. J. A. Ross, 190; The Bibliotheca Historica of Diodorus Siculus translated by John Skelton, edited by F. M. Salter and H. L. R. Edwards, 192; The James Carmichaell Collection of Proverbs in Scots, edited by M. L. Anderson, 194; *King Henry VIII*, edited by R. A. Foakes (Arden Shakespeare), 195; Philip Massinger. The Man and the Playwright, by T. A. Dunn, 198; English Sentimental Drama, by Arthur Sherbo, 200; Samuel Johnson in Grub Street, by Edward A. Bloom, 201; Symbol and Image in William Blake, by George Wingfield Digby, 202; The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, edited by Kathleen Coburn. Vol. I, 1794–1804, 203; Italy and the English Romantics. The Italianate Fashion in Early Nineteenth-Century England, by C. P. Brand, 205; Georgina Hogarth and the Dickens Circle, by Arthur A. Adrian, 207; Joseph Conrad. Achievement and Decline, by Thomas Moser; Joseph Conrad. Discovery in Design, by Robert F. Haugh, 209; On Poetry and Poets, by T. S. Eliot, 211; The Harvest of Tragedy, by T. R. Henn, 213; Short Notices, 216; Summary of Periodical Literature, 218; List of Publications Received, 221.

'THE GREEN COUNT' AND *SIR GAWAIN AND THE GREEN KNIGHT*[1]

By S. R. T. O. D'ARDENNE

IN a recent article[2] Mr. Highfield raised the question: 'Was there a green knight in fact as well as in legend?' To which he replied: 'The answer cannot yet be given. But that there was a "green squire" is certain.' This paper is a tentative answer to his question.

First of all it might have been more accurate to state that there were at least two green squires in fourteenth-century England. Besides Simon Newton with whom Mr. Highfield is primarily concerned, there was a member of the Black Prince's retinue who was killed when he tried to help King Peter the Cruel. He was called, says Froissart, 'Messires Raouls Helme, qui jadis avoit estet nommés li Vert-Escuiers'.[3] And although Mr. Highfield gives interesting facts about certain West Midland families, especially the Newtons, who may (or may not) be connected with the author of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, there remains the chief drawback to his tentative identification: a squire is not a knight, and a *scutifer viridis* is not so picturesque and striking a character as a *grene knyȝt*.

But there was a 'green knight' in the fourteenth century, famous for his magnificence, his rich hospitality, his gallant deeds, and the splendour of his garments, by which he was known all over the world as *The Green Count*, *Le Comte Vert*, *Il Conte Verde*. He was Amadeus VI, Count of Savoy (1334–83), a contemporary of the author of *Sir Gawain*.

How, when, and why did he acquire the nickname? In his *Gestez et Croniques de la Mayson de Savoye*,[4] the fifteenth-century Savoy chronicler

[1] A summary of the views expressed in this article was read to the conference of the International Association of University Professors of English at Cambridge in 1956. The present text has been considerably enlarged, and offers additional evidence.

[2] 'The Green Squire', *M. Æ.*, xxii (1953), 18–23.

[3] *Chroniques*, ed. K. de Lettenhove (Bruxelles, 1869–77), vii. 272.

[4] Ed. F. E. Bollati (Turin, 1879), ii. 80. Scholars do not agree on the exact date of this famous and spectacular tournament. According to Jean Cordey (*Les Comtes de Savoie et les Rois de France* (Paris, 1911), p. 100) and others, it was the Chambéry tournament (1348). For Plaisance (*Histoire des Savoyens* (Chambéry, 1910), p. 199), it was the tournament Amadeus gave on the occasion of the wedding of his sister Blanche and Galeazzo Visconti in 1351. Quite recently, Marie-José, ex-Queen of Italy (*La Maison de Savoie* (Paris, 1956), p. 160), supported Cognasso's view (*Il Conte Verde* (Torino, 1926)), that it was the Bourg-en-Bresse tournament (1353). It is a fact that from 1347 to 1356 Amadeus organized no less than ten tournaments. But for the present purpose the date does not matter. It is the description which counts and on this point scholars agree. The magnificence of the fabulous Amadeus very likely lingered in Christine de Pisan's memory, when

Jehan Servion gives the account (not a legend) of the tournament in which Amadeus appeared for the first time dressed in green:

> Le conte Ame vint sur le reng atout ses xj compagnons, toux vestus de cendal vert & leurs chiuaulx couers de mesmes. Et sy y avoit xij dames vestues & parees de mesmes . . . & avoyent les xij dames xij cordons de soye verde, chescune menant son chiuallier atache a la bride & le heaulme en la teste & la lance au point & tout couvert de verd.

When the tournament was due to begin the ladies released the knights, who started fighting. After the contest the ladies again bound the knights and led them to the castle, where their weapons were taken from them. After dinner the knights received their rewards: they had the right to kiss their ladies and to receive presents from them. Amadeus accepted the kisses but told the ladies to give the rings to the knights who, he said, 'mieulx les ont gagneez que moy'. To this the knights answered 'que mieulx heussent ames le baisier des damez . . . La risee en fust grande; & lors recomensca la feste en grant trihumphe, qui dura iusques au iour du matin'. This lasted three days and 'depuis lon laissa le nom du conte Ame & fust appelles le conte verd', the name he is generally given in historical (and other) books. Indeed, says Cordey (*Les Comtes*, p. 101, n. 1),

> après 1348 sauf de très rares exceptions, les riches vêtements qu'il se faisait confectionner furent tous verts, de même que les plumes de son panache, les housses de ses chevaux, les tentures de sa tente, la livrée de ses gens. Bien plus, il est très rare que les robes et costumes qu'il offrait en cadeau aux gens de son entourage, à ses amis, à ses conseillers, ou à son fils fussent autrement teints. Il demeura jusqu'à sa mort fidèle à cette coutume.

A very striking example of this is to be found in the gorgeous description of his departure to the crusade: he 'habilla tous les autres princes et cheualiers de sayons de velours verd, brodez d'une riche broderie d'or trait, faite à la devise des trois lacs d'amour, et en ceste parure luimesme sortit de son logis . . .' and all 'sembloyent des Rolans'.[1] So picturesque a character was bound to appeal to the imagination of people and artists. In fact, 'he still lives in the Savoy folklore and ballads as the legendary knight of chivalry'.[2] Le Comte Vert, says V. de Saint-Genis, 'reste pour les régions

she described the tournament in *Le Liure du duc des Vrays Amans* (so closely related to the family of the Green Count's wife) in which 'Escuiers qui se y porterent' were 'vert vestus' and with them 'vint damoyselles y furent, vestues de vert'. Moreover, she caused (or at any rate allowed) the artist who illustrated the scene in MS. Harley 4431 to represent the victorious knight, not as a white knight, which we expect from the context, but as a green knight, wearing on his helmet the Savoy panache, white and red.

[1] See Guillaume Paradin, *Chronique de Savoye* (Lyons, 1561), p. 241, and Servion, *Gestez*, p. 129.

[2] F. de Filippi, 'The Relations of the House of Savoy with the Court of England', *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, viii (1917–18), 449.

alpines, l'équivalent de ce que fut en Angleterre le roi Arthur ou dans la Gaule carolingienne le paladin Roland'.[1] Moreover, he is the hero of at least three epic poems, namely the *Amédéide*, written in 924 alexandrines two centuries after his death by Alphonse Delbène, abbot of Hautecombe, the *Amédeïde*, poem in five cantos by Doctor Trésal, and *Le Comte Vert*, by Doctor Jacquemoud, poem in twelve cantos.[2]

The Green Count was not only one of the most spectacular princes of the fourteenth century, he was also one of the most magnificent hosts. Chroniclers are lyrical on the subject. Among these Froissart has much to say, and from first-hand experience, for he describes a 'feste ossi ou j'estoie'. This feast was the splendid reception which Amadeus gave on the occasion of the wedding of his niece Violante Visconti and Lionel, Duke of Clarence, in 1368. It lasted three days and filled the numerous English guests with wonder.[3] In his *Chronicles* Froissart simply recorded that: 'Li gentils contes de Savoie le [i.e. Lionel] rechut très honnerablement en Chambéri en très grans reviaus de danses, de caroles et tous esbatemens. Au tierc jour, il parti, et le conduissi li dis contes de Savoie jusques à Melans' (vii. 251–2). But in his *Prison Amoureuse*, written about 1373, Froissart, the poet, required fifty-three lines to describe it.[4] Lionel died in Italy soon after his marriage. His end was mysterious. In Froissart's own words, 'il morut assés mervilleusement . . . Si souppeçonnèrent que on ne l'euist empoisonnet et en fist guerre moult grande et moult forte li sires Despenssiers as seigneurs de Melans et à leurs gens'. And Froissart adds in the concise version of his *Chronicles*: 'En le fin, messires li contes de Savoie s'en ensonnia et les mist à acord',[5] a proof of the esteem in which the English held the Green Count. There are others.

As early as 1351 there had been some 'colloquium de matrimonio contrahendo inter dictum dominum comitem Sabaudie [i.e. Amadeus VI] et dominam Ysabellam, filiam serenissimi principis domini Edduardi, regis Anglie'. But more important still is another printed by Cordey and dated

[1] *Histoire de Savoie depuis les origines jusqu'à l'annexion* (Paris, 1868–9), i. 347.

[2] Published in *Mémoires et documents publiés par la Société savoisienne d'histoire et d'archéologie*, tome viii (Chambéry, 1864); Albertville, 1843; Paris, 1844.

[3] Lionel departed from England 'moult estofféement et en grant arroy'; he was attended by a retinue of 457 men who, with the enormous number of 1,280 horses, were carried in 39 ships and 13 small vessels. See Rymer, *Foedera* (The Hague, 1739–45), iii. 145, and W. Longman, *Life and Times of Edward the Third* (London, 1869), ii. 140–1. Rymer, (iii. 144) gives the list of Lionel's retainers. Among these we find many West Midland names, e.g. Johannes Abburbery (Flintshire and Denbigh), Walterus Bromswych (Warwickshire), Ricardus Baskervill (south-east Cheshire), Edwardus le Despenser (Cheshire), Rogerus Hakensowe (Lancashire). In another document dated 1354 we find the same names with the addition of the name of Petrus de Grandissono, dominus de Oxenale (Gloucester; see below).

[4] *Poésies*, ed. A. Scheler (Bruxelles, 1870), i. 44.

[5] Ed. de Lettenhove, vii. 251–2.

4 November 1365.[1] In it the Black Prince gives his soldiers orders to spare the estates of the Green Count 'pour ce que nostre tres chier cousin, le comte de Savoie, a sovent fait et fait de jour en autre grandes courtoisies a touz noz genz que passent parmy sa seignorie'. Indeed the Savoy Chronicles abound in examples of the considerate way with which the English army treated the Savoy soldiers against whom they were fighting in France. Thus although Amadeus fought with France and the Empire against Edward III, yet 'there remained the greatest esteem between him and the English subjects of Edward'.[2] I have pointed out the important part played by the Green Count in settling the conflict which arose between 'li sires Despenssiers et les seigneurs de Melans' after Lionel's death. Moreover, 'English pilgrims and diplomats who happened to cross Savoy on their way either to Italy or to the Holy Land could always count on an hospitable welcome at the court of the Prince, where splendid entertainments were often given in their honour'.[2] The importance of this statement will not escape the attention of those who, accepting a common authorship for the four poems of MS. Cotton Nero A x, think with Gollancz that 'the numerous references in these two poems [*Cleanness* and *Patience*] to the sea would lead one to infer that the poet . . . may have weathered the fierce tempests he described. His wanderings may have brought him even to the holy city whose heavenly prototype he discerned in the visionary scenes of *Pearl*.'[3] If so the poet may have enjoyed Amadeus's hospitality, which he remembered when he described Bertilak's generous entertainment of guests. Now it is interesting to note that, according to Mr. Highfield, the Green Squire, that is Simon Newton, 'might have been sent to Pavia to prepare the way for the embassy which shortly followed from England to arrange the marriage between Edward's son, Lionel of Antwerp, and Violante Visconti, daughter of Galeazzo II'. It is thus quite possible that the Green Count and the Green Squire met.[4] It is a fact that the Green Count, since he arranged and negotiated the marriage of his niece and Lionel, came into contact with the two English envoys sent to Milan for this purpose, namely Humphrey Bohun, Earl of Hereford, and Sir Nicholas Tamworth, both West Midland noblemen, the former famous for his literary tastes and collection of rare books.

[1] Cordey, Pièces justificatives nos. 26 and 33. We miss the name of Amadeus in the long list of the Lady de Coucy's suitors published by Dr. Savage in his recent book *The Gawain-Poet* (Chapel Hill, 1956), pp. 56–58.

[2] de Filippi, *Relations*, p. 449. [3] *Cambridge History of English Literature*, i. 331.

[4] Two facts concerning the Newton family may be noted: (*a*) two Pulesdons, relatives of the Green Squire, were 'squires in the retinue of Lionel, duke of Clarence, when he went into Ireland in 1361' (Highfield, pp. 20–21); (*b*) one Humphrey Newton (1466–1536), a native of the Hundred of Macclesfield (Cheshire), wrote poetry (preserved in the Capesthorne MS.) which is strangely reminiscent of *Sir Gawain*. See R. H. Robbins, 'A Gawain Epigone', *M.L.N.*, lviii (1943), 366.

For the present purpose, it is important that the Green Count came into personal contact with West Midland men who were closely connected with the so-called alliterative revival. He was thus well known in England, where his family had been popular ever since the marriage of Eleonore of Provence and Henry III Plantagenet. The Queen's uncles, William, Boniface, Thomas, and Peter, frequently came over to England. Moreover, Boniface became Archbishop of Canterbury and Peter Earl of Richmond and Essex. The latter built in London a palace which became known as 'The Savoy', a name which has survived to this day. Thus these Savoy princes left a permanent and rather pleasant trace of their passage and hospitality in England. In the fourteenth century, the Savoy became the London home of John of Gaunt, who entertained, among many others, Chaucer and his friend 'Monseigneur Othe de Granson, de la terre de Savoye, chevalier d'onneur du roy d'Engleterre et du duc de Lancastre', the Savoy court poet, whom the English poet hailed as 'flour of hem that make in Fraunce'. Now Master Othe was the son of Guillaume de Granson, the Green Count's faithful retainer, whose name appears over and over again in the Savoy Chronicles, and always in close association with the 'Glorieux Amédée'. This Guillaume of Granson 'auoit este au seruice du roy dEngleterre',[1] and was made a knight of the Order of the Collar when Amadeus founded it in 1364 (see below). A branch of his family had settled in England, where they possessed estates in Herefordshire and Ireland.[2] We know that Master Othe spent more than twenty years in England. And when he was captured by the French early in 1368 he was shortly released at the petition of the Green Count and Marguerite, Countess of Burgundy and Flanders. It is highly probable that he spoke enthusiastically of his beloved and splendid liege lord, the magnificent Green Count. Thus Amadeus was known in England, and in the West Midlands in particular. Moreover, besides Humphrey Bohun and Sir Nicholas Tamworth (see p. 116 above), Lionel's only child, Philippa, 'married in the spring of 1368' (so *D.N.B.*), i.e. before Lionel's departure to Italy, to Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March, was certainly told of the splendid reception and entertainment the Green Count gave in honour of her father, and of the part he played before, during, and after that ill-fated marriage.

We know that the Mortimers, the Bohuns, and the Beauchamps were connected; they were related in blood, they were neighbours, and they

[1] Servion, p. 120.

[2] See *Herefordshire Doomsday*, ed. V. H. Galbraith and J. Tait (London, 1950), p. 114; H. Braddy, 'Messire Oton de Graunson, Chaucer's Savoyard Friend', *S.P.*, xxxv (1938), 515–31, and *Chaucer and the French Poet Graunson* (Baton Rouge, 1947); A. Piaget, *Oton de Grandson, sa vie et ses poésies* (Lausanne, 1941).

were associated in the baronial opposition to the king.[1] These rivalries were reflected in literature. There were two schools of poetry opposing each other: the court poetry well exemplified by the works of Chaucer and Gower; and the West Midland alliterative poetry, written in 'þat strange Inglis', which, according to Robert Manning, 'symple men cannot ken', but which was kept alive from generation to generation 'in londe so hatȝ ben longe'. As Dorothy Everett pointed out, these great families, the Mortimers, Bohuns, and Beauchamps, may deliberately have encouraged and fostered verse of native origin as a rival to that poetry, more closely dependent on French patterns, which was written by Chaucer and others. At least we know that about 1360 one William translated into alliterative poetry the French romance of William of Palerme at the request of

> þe hende erl of hereford humfray de boune
> þe gode king edwardes douȝter was his dere moder;
> he let make þis mater. in þis maner speche,
> for hem þat knowe no frensche. ne neuer vnderstonde.[2]

We know that at least the Bohuns and the Beauchamps were booklovers. In their wills we find many legacies of books, French Arthurian romances and chronicles.[3] Thus the West Midland poets could find these stories in books or, in the *Gawain* poet's own words, 'in toune' (l. 31). It would be interesting indeed to know whether the poet had a 'town' in mind. 'Without article', says *O.E.D.* (under *Town*, 4.b), 'after prepositions, as *in* . . ., it refers to the town in or near which the speaker is at the moment; or to the chief town of the district or province, the capital'; and adds a note: 'There are earlier uses referring to London, but only as said by persons living

[1] 'When the Black Prince died in June 1376, the thorny question of who was next heir after his son Richard, either John of Gaunt or Philippa and her son, was raised and left unanswered. . . . The history of England for a century was to be shaped by the rivalries of these royal lines with their vast estates. . . . The Commons, who displayed a remarkable boldness and initiative and acted with the Lords, chose as their Speaker Peter de la Mare, the steward of the Earl of March' (Lionel's son-in-law). C. W. Previté-Orton, *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History* ii (1952), 895–6.

[2] Ed. W. W. Skeat, E.E.T.S., E.S. i (1867), ll. 5530–3.

[3] Among the books bequeathed by Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, daughter of this Humphrey of Bohun (died 1373), there was a copy of a book called *Arthure de Bretaigne*, and another of the *Histoire du chivaler a cigne*. Moreover, MS. Royal 20 D IV, containing the French romance of *Lancelot du Lac*, belonged (1380–8, that is the time generally assigned to the composition of *Sir Gawain*) to another daughter of his, Mary (died 1394), wife of Henry, Earl of Derby (afterwards King Henry IV). Indeed the illuminated capital B on f. 102^{v} was repainted and the Bohun coat of arms was added in it (at the same time as the artist repainted the miniature on the same folio) by one of the English artists who executed a number of fine illuminated manuscripts for Mary and other members of the Bohun family, among which are the most important surviving examples of English illumination in the third quarter of the fourteenth century. It is interesting to see that at that time, in that remote part of England, Arthurian romances were still enjoyed, read, and translated, when they were going out of fashion in France and at the English court.

there.' But even if the phrase just means 'in society', 'among men', it refers to 'court circles' where French (as well as English) was spoken, recited, and understood. And we know that these great West Midland families lived on a royal footing, which infuriated John of Gaunt. There the poet must have heard great talk about the splendid foreign Green Count; and if the lines cited above may refer to a lost French original (Tolkien's and Gordon's view), they may also refer to actual stories, rumours, and tales of current events.

It has lately been argued by Dr. Ethel Seaton[1] that Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*, 'obviously a marriage poem', was written to celebrate the marriage of Lionel of Antwerp and Violante Visconti. According to her the double acrostic anagrams yield their names, those of her parents, and the names of the two English envoys sent to Milan to open negotiations, namely Humphrey Bohun, Earl of Hereford, and Sir Nicholas Tamworth. Now this view, although questionable and questioned, has 'brought forward another possibility for consideration . . .' and 'Lionel's courtship of Violanta can still be considered a possible inspiration for the conjectured *Ur-Parlement*'. Indeed, the ceremonies which celebrated the event were so splendid that they were spoken of at all European courts.

In *Sir Gawain* we find perhaps a faint and West Midland echo of that historical event, rather than, as Professor Hulbert would have it, the commemoration of 'some unrecorded Round Table held by a Mortimer'.[2] It is not perhaps without significance that mention is made in this poem of *þe duk of Clarence*. Lionel was the first duke of Clarence, and the only one contemporary with our Middle English poem. There is no doubt that the mention of this title was meant as a compliment to Lionel. It has been argued that a duke of Clarence exists in French romances, say the *Roman de Merlin*, dated 1316, a fact which Professor Hulbert considers 'as perhaps the best of all evidences that the author of *GGK* knew the Vulgate [Arthurian Romances]', for, he adds, 'only in the Vulgate do we find such development of the Duke of Clarence as to make him memorable and likely to be mentioned in another book'.[3] This would be true if it were not an English poem. For there is no denying that a fourteenth-century English audience would readily associate the title with Lionel. When we read Froissart's gorgeous descriptions of the splendid entertainments (which again lasted three days) that the Green Count gave in Lionel's honour we are plunged right into the atmosphere of our Middle English poem. No doubt such splendour was bound to grow in the telling to the point of

[1] 'The Parlement of Foules and Lionel of Clarence', *M.Æ.*, xxv (1957), 168–74. For a criticism of Dr. Seaton's view and her reply to it see *M.Æ.*, xxvi (1957), 107–11.

[2] *M.P.*, xiii (1916), 718.

[3] 'The Name of the Green Knight', *Manly Anniversary Studies* (Chicago, 1923), p. 19.

reaching the fabulous. In the green light of his garments, so closely associated with Faërie, the foreign Count could well lay a spell on the imagination of a West Midland author brought up on fairy tales and the fabulous legends of King Arthur and his knights. The more so as a 'green knight' was most unusual compared with the numerous Black Knights, Red Knights, and Blue Knights. In fact, even in the ill-famed *Wyral*, where 'wonde þer bot lyte / þat auþer God oþer gome wyth goud hert louied', that is, where we should have expected to find the 'green men' referred to by Kittredge and Loomis, Gawain was told that 'þay seȝe neuer no segge þat watȝ of suche hweȝ / of grene'.

This is the proper answer to our query. There is no question in our poem of the green people as they appear in the tales or books dealing with them, that is, people leading a particular life of their own and totally different in their appearance, behaviour, feelings, and destiny from men. The Green Knight is not a genuine green man. He is a green man in appearance only, a 'gome gered in grene' (79), 'a wyȝe wruxled in grene' (219). He is simply an enchanted man. His buoyancy, his rich laughter, his whole attitude and language, at once easy-going and provocative, show the white skin behind the deluding green complexion. His humanity is indeed his most striking and obvious quality. And when we meet him in his own shape and complexion, he is so true to life that we wonder how he could have been mistaken for a vegetation god or other mythical creature. He is and remains, whether he is enchanted or not, Bertilak de Hautdesert. Throughout the poem we feel that the poet's sympathy is with 'þe leue lorde of þe londe'. The fact is, he is more human, more alive than Arthur and even Gawain.[1] As Professor Gwyn Jones has said, he 'is the "dynamic" character of the story. It is he who sets things going.'[2] He is too true to nature not to suggest an actual or contemporary model.

But this is denied by Professor Jones (and other scholars). He states that 'It seems significant then that while our author could see King Arthur's court in the mirror of the contemporary court of Richard II, he had no contemporary model for the Green Knight'. Had he not really? If we accept Gollancz's suggestion that 'the figure of Gawain was drawn, however flatteringly, from some notable contemporary',[3] whether the Black Prince

[1] When the poet refers to him he generally uses epithets such as *leue, fre, wynnelych, god*, which emphasize his humanity (and the sympathy of the author). This is in striking opposition to his treatment of Gawain's character, whose artificiality and conventionality best appear in his sole use of substantives borrowed from the Old English stock of poetic diction, as *freke, wyȝe, renk, segge, lede, burne, haþel*. The author seldom uses an epithet for Gawain, and when he does so it simply emphasizes Gawain's knightly virtues, as *derf, noble, bold, gentyl, hende*. In fact Gawain only becomes a *myry mon* when he is with *þe gay lady*.

[2] *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, a prose translation (London, 1952), p. 5.

[3] 'Chivalry in the Medieval Poetry', in E. Prestage, *Chivalry* (London, 1928), p. 178.

(so Isaac Jackson, *Anglia*, xxxvii (1913), 410), or the Sire de Coucy (so Savage), why should not the same view be taken concerning the Green Knight, alias Bertilak de Hautdesert? There is no denying that there exists some striking resemblance between the poetical and the historical green knights, best seen perhaps in the duality of their personalities: the magnificent and fantastic green men on the one hand, and the gallant, kind-hearted, and splendid hosts on the other. Moreover, there is more than mere coincidence, I think, in such details as the feast (and the tournament) lasting three days, the kisses preferred to gifts, the knights bound fast by means of green strings, the horses entirely clad in green. Indeed, the tournament Amadeus, that Savoy green knight, riding his huge horse, Lucifer,[1] which

> avoit le front couvert, à grands ondes flotoit
> ung grand panache verd sur sa teste esgarée,

must have struck his contemporaries as an exceptional man since they discarded his name Amadeus, and he became known all over the world as the Green Count. To our English poet he may well have appeared as an 'alvisch mon'. Yet beneath this strange appearance, both Amadeus and Bertilak were human beings and splendid hosts. Chambéry Castle, situated in a desolate country covered with thick forests and rocky mountains, strangely reminiscent of the Green Chapel, 'avait gardé les usages de l'antique chevalerie', where 'vindrent dames & signieurs de toutez les pars des pays du conte. Et la eust tornoys, ioustes & beourdis, dances, morisques & momeryez.' Chambéry might have been the name of Bertilak's hospitable castle. Of course I do not claim that it is an actual description of it and of Savoy. Yet so many known and unknown, conscious and subconscious factors enter into the making of a literary work that any actual elements that may have appealed to the imagination of an author must be taken into account.

There are indeed in *Sir Gawain* other elements than those just mentioned which strengthen the association of the Green Knight and the Green Count without excluding a genuine Celtic influence. First of all there is the name of the Green Knight. At the end of the poem he reveals his name to Gawain: Bertilak de Hautdesert, a French surname.[2] Although it is not

[1] See Cordey, p. 244, n. 2, quoting Turin archives, *Tesoreria generale*, no. 22: 'Dicto Viennensi, custodiendi *magnum equum* domini dictum *Lucifer*'—an ominous name, if we remember that, when first met, the Green Knight and his horse appeared as if they had come hot from hell.

[2] Professor Loomis (*Arthurian Tradition and Chrestien de Troyes* (New York, 1949), p. 420) sees in the name 'Bercilak a corruption of the common name *bachlach*, as applied to Bercilak's original, Curoi'. I rather see in it a misreading *Bercilak* for *Bertilak*, a case of the frequent confusion *t*/*c*. In the *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, ed. Sommer, the forms *Bertelak* and *Bercelai*/*Bertelai*, for the well-known French name

recorded, it is built on the same pattern as actual surnames like Hautéserve (which means exactly the same as Hautdesert), Hautecloque, Hauchamps, Hauterive, Hautecombe, as Amédée de Hauterive, abbot of Hautecombe (1139–44), many of which point to Savoy (cf. Haute Savoie) but are not limited to it.

It has been suggested (as by Tolkien and Gordon) that Hautdesert is the name of the Green Chapel. But as Professor Loomis says (*Arthurian Tradition*, p. 282, n. 2), 'this view is contradicted by the fact that the Chapel lies in a valley'. He further suggests that Hautdesert is the name of the country ruled by Bertilak. And indeed the Bertilak of the French romance 'estoit du lignaige a Claudas de la Terre Deserte' (Sommer, *Vulgate*, v. 422/18). To change it into Hautdesert would thus be a deliberate attempt by the author to give it an extra French (or Savoy) flavour. It may be the name of the castle. According to Professor Hulbert,[1] it may be an intentional slight alteration of *Beaudesert*, 'the Norman French castle held by Thurstan de Montfort in the reign of Stephen', and built on an eminence at the present Henley-in-Arden in Warwickshire.[2] It is noteworthy that the only record of the name for the fourteenth century is spelt *Baudesert*. There are indeed sporadic examples of the introduction of French *haut* in English place-names by popular etymology, as *Hautbois* in Norfolk instead of *Hobbesse*, ever since the thirteenth century (see Ekwall, *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*). But I am inclined to think that *de Hautdesert* is simply the Green Knight's name, and it is a French, possibly a Savoy, name.

There are other important elements in the poem which may (or may not) connect it with the Green Count. Among these I will consider three: (*a*) the Green Girdle; (*b*) Gawain's shield; (*c*) the Christmas and New Year festivities described so lavishly by the West Midland poet. For it is a fact that Christmas feasts prolonged into New Year were particularly in favour at the Savoy court. Hulbert notes that 'in one case mention is made that the Green Knight (*sic*) went home for the feast at New Year's' (*M.P.*, xiii (1916), 717). And he refers to *Monumenta Historiae Patriae*. Actually mention is made of the Green Count (not the Green Knight) sending for his wife, Bonne de Bourbon, so that she might spend the Christmas (not the New Year) feasts with him at Aoste in Italy.[3] Thus in that slip, Hulbert

Bertholai, are evidenced. But the origin of the name does not matter very much; Christian names were of Latin, Germanic, Celtic, or Greek origin whether in France, Germany, or Great Britain. The origin of the surname is more important for it reveals the author's intention, and *de Hautdesert* is a French surname.

[1] *M.P.*, xxviii (1930–1), 420.

[2] *The Place-Names of Warwickshire*, E.P.N.S., xiii (1936), 199.

[3] See also Servion, p. 195: 'Il cheuaucha en la cite dOste pour faire les festes de Noel auec la contesse Bonne sa femme, quil auoit fait venir pour soy conioir auec elle.'

made an unconscious association of the Green Count and the Green Knight. And it is a pity that he did not notice it, for he was the first to throw some light on the two other facts. Indeed he was the first to identify Gawain's coat of arms, which was 'of schyr goule3 / Wyth þe pentangel depaynt of pure golde hwe3' (619–20). The pentangle, he says (p. 728), 'has never been so used in England, but it does occur on the Continent. According to Rietstap (*Armorial Général*, Suppl. v, app. p. 3) two families bore gules, a pentalpha or: a German family named Stahler, and a Swiss named Bory d'Arnex'.[1] 'About the first', continues Hulbert, 'I have been able to find nothing. The second, however, presents some curious facts. Since the beginning of the fifteenth century it has occupied estates in the Pays de Vaud, which were dependencies of the duke of Savoy. Though it cannot be traced before the fifteenth century, the family may have extended back into the fourteenth century, or it may have acquired its arms from some other family resident in the domains of the Counts of Savoy. At any rate, there is a connection between Savoy and the pentangle in the very colours stated by the poet of *GGK*.' This statement needs precision. Rietstap states that the Bory d'Arnex family 'de temps *immémorial* [italics mine] avait des droits de bougeoisie à Versoix (Pays de Gex)'. Now the barony of Gex became definitely included among the Green Count's estates in 1355 after many petty and cruel wars with the Dauphin Charles. The Bory family must have been loyal to the Savoy counts, for they received *later on* estates in the Vaud country, which had always been a Savoy possession and they added the name d'Arnex to their patronymic. Now it is noteworthy that it is precisely in the Vaud country that the Gransons had their family seat, and they were closely connected with Arnex. Indeed 'en 1049 le seigneur Adalbert de Grandson donna au couvent de Romainmôtier tout ce qu'il possédait à Arnex. Ce fut sans doute l'origine des biens du couvent qu'il fit administrer dès le XII[e] siècle par un mayor: office héréditaire dont la famille prit le nom d'Arnex' (*D.H.B.S.*, under *d'Arnex*). It is true also that they apparently changed their coat of arms to that described in *D.H.B.S.* under *Bory*.[1] The French branch very likely kept the original shield as described by Rietstap. But for the present study it is important that it is in Switzerland, in the ancient county (later duchy) of Savoy, that we find the pentacle used in heraldry. I have found after a casual glance at the Savoy Heraldic Archives and at *D.H.B.S.* at least five Swiss families whose coat of arms has a pentacle.

As to the Stahler family, it is an old Swabian family whose seat was thus

[1] Yet see *Dictionnaire historique et biographique de la Suisse* (Neuchâtel, 1924), under *Bory* (ii. 149), where the coat of arms is described as 'd'azur au pentacle d'argent, à une montagne de trois coupeaux du même en pointe'. Yet it is the same family, since it is described as a 'Famille vaudoise de Coppet, Grivins, Arnex, Versoix'.

close to the estates of the Savoy princes, and like them under the suzerainty of the German emperors. The earliest references to the family which I have been able to find make mention of one *Wolfram dictus Staheler*, 1305, in Bamberg,[1] and of one *Jacobus dictus Staheler*, 1385, in Olmütz.[2] It is a name denoting a craft and means 'wohl Stahlschmied' or 'Metall gewinnende und verarbeitende Gewerbe'.[3] The plebeian origin of that family in the fourteenth century is against any connexion with our highly aristocratic poem. Moreover, they may have acquired their coat of arms from some noble family to whom they happened later on to be related. Yet I would not go so far as to state with Dr. Savage (*Gawain-Poet*, p. 158) that 'the elaborate description of the pentangle in our poem was meant for designating a particular person', that is, the Sire de Coucy, 'whose device', he states, actually was the 'endless knot'. For one thing the 'endless knot' has a more ancient and significant meaning, and the de Coucy shield had only gules in common with Gawain's.

Now we reach the most important point: the Girdle, which in the Green Knight's own words was 'grene as my goune'.

It has been suggested that the decision of the lords and the ladies of the Round Table to wear a green baldric in honour of Gawain's loyalty is an indication that 'the poem was composed with reference to some order of knights'. Tolkien and Gordon note that 'some orders had collars which were worn much as Gawain wore the lace (2485)', but they add 'as far as is known neither that order [sc. the Garter] *nor any other* [italics mine] wore a green collar or band'. In this they are wrong: in 1364 the Green Count created 'vng ordre . . . en lonnour de Nostre Dame', and he ordered that 'le collier seroit fait dor a feuillies de lorier entretenans lune a lautre, esmalliez de vert esmail, & en la rompure dessoubz auroit vng pendant a iij neux de las entrelasses, conrespondant lung a lautre, & au my lieu du las auroit son mot quil portoit, questoit FERT'.[4] 'Au bas de ce collier pendoit une petite image . . . vne effigie de nostre Dame, & dun Ange qui la salue, dont se nommoit l'ordre de l'Annonciade.'[5] And 'vng chescung des chivalliers deussent dire chescung iour xv avemaryez'.[4] Now Gawain shows a special cult of the Virgin, and the pentangle refers to her joys (646–7). Among the first fifteen knights corresponding to the fifteen joys of Our Lady, mention should be made of two names: 'Messire Guillaume

[1] Heintze-Cascorbi, *Die deutschen Familiennamen* (Berlin, 1933).

[2] E. Schwarz, *Deutsche Namenforschung* (Göttingen, 1949), i. 125.

[3] A. Bach, *Deutsche Namenkunde*, vol. i, *Die deutschen Personennamen* (2nd edn., 1942), § 246/6.

[4] Servion, p. 114. It is interesting to note that Gawain wore *þe lace with a knot* (2487). Knots were a most important and characteristic feature of the Collar. They were known everywhere as the Savoy knots, 'les noeuds de Savoye'. They are still seen on the ceilings of Swiss churches which formerly belonged to the Savoy house.

[5] Paradin, p. 239.

de Granscon . . . & messire Richard Musard, vn vailliant chiuaillier d'Engleterre, bon & hardy, fut le xv^e.' Of the Granson family enough has been said above. The Musard family left traces of their name in *Miserden* earlier *Musardere Castle*[1] connected with the West Midlands, especially Gloucester. Sir Maurice Powicke mentions a 'Ralf Musard, sheriff and castellan of Gloucestershire, who had served as one of the itinerant justices in 1218–19' and whose name was associated with that of 'the powerful Walter de Lacy, sheriff and castellan of Hereford', both described as 'two English barons of unimpeachable respectability'. In a footnote he adds: 'He took his name from *Miserden* (in Gloucestershire).'[2] Moreover, in the *Victoria History of the County of Lancashire* (viii. 75, n. 5) mention is made of a Bridge Musard in the Forest of Quernmore (Lonsdale Hundred).

Hulbert was the first to allude to the Order of the Collar with reference to *Sir Gawain*. But he 'did not claim anything except that it is a possibility. If one must refer *GGK* to some particular order, the Order of the Collar meets the conditions better than the Garter does, but that is all' (p. 718). And he never associated the 'Grene Knyȝt' and the 'Green Count' except in the slip mentioned above. It might be further argued that the Collar of Savoy was not worn as a baldric. But that it was worn as such in *Sir Gawain* is probably a deliberate way of associating it with the hunts,[3] that is as a reminder of the temptations, and of Gawain's vow. Indeed we are told that in France, on hearing of the shameful death of Blanche de Bourbon, the wife of Don Pedro and sister-in-law of the Green Count, 500 'gentilshommes' vowed to revenge it. Accordingly they put on a green baldric 'conformément aux statuts de chevalerie'.[4] Green is indeed a liturgical colour symbolizing misery of heart and spirit. Moreover, 'it was the especial colour of knights errant' (see Cornish, *Chivalry* (London, 1901), p. 103, n. 2).

But if we have good reasons to associate the Green Count and the Green Knight, we shall wisely stop at this point. We shall not suggest that his wife, Bonne de Bourbon, and her faithful knight, Master Othe, may have served as models for the Lady of the Castle and Gawain. For we should leave the world of actuality for the realm of sheer hypothesis. Yet there

[1] See Dugdale, *The Baronage of England* (1675–6), i. 512–13; and Ekwall, *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*.

[2] *King Henry III and the Lord Edward* (Oxford, 1947), i. 58.

[3] Cf. Chaucer's description in the *General Prologue* of the Yeoman, who was

clad in cote and hood of grene

. . . . . .

An horn he bar, the bawdric was of grene
A forster was he, soothely, as I gesse.

[4] A. Mazas, *Vie des grands capitaines français au Moyen Age* (Paris, 3rd edn., 1845), p. 164.

is no denying that both were great historical figures of their time: Bonne de Bourbon, that 'very remarkable woman', the 'Great Countess' as she was called, was appointed both by the Green and the Red Counts as their heiress and regent of their estates before they died, showing that they trusted her completely. As to Master Othe, he was considered 'de son temps et, plus tard encore, jusqu'au milieu du xv siècle, comme le modèle des amoureux. On le donnait en exemple aux jeunes écuyers qui débutaient dans la double carrière des armes et de l'amour. On le mettait sur le même rang que les chevaliers de la Table Ronde . . . Lancelot et Tristan.'[1] This would tally with the view recently expressed that *Sir Gawain* was written for young squires as a model to imitate. A mere hint at these two would certainly enhance 'that humanity, which was the greatest virtue of the medieval romancer'.[2] But I entirely agree with Dr. Savage when he states (in contradistinction to what he had said previously) that 'the existence of prototypes in actual life might have prompted and suggested, but did not *dictate* the course of his [the Gawain-poet's] story'.

I have, I think, answered Mr. Highfield's question. There was a green knight in fact as well as in legend in the fourteenth century, a knight such as to attract and to appeal to the imagination of an English poet, a knight whose name, personality, and splendid hospitality were known to West-Midland men. And his name was Amadeus VI, Count of Savoy, better known as *Il Conte Verde*, the Green Count.

[1] Piaget, p. 7. Cf. also *Le Livre des faicts du Mareschal de Boucicaut*, ed. Michaud and Poujoulat in *Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1836), ii. 220: 'Si comme on lit de Lancelot, de Tristan, et de plusieurs autres, que amour feit bons, et à renommée attaindre. Et mesmement de nostre vivant y a eu assez de nobles hommes de France . . . si comme on dict de messire Othe de Gransson, du bon connestable de Sancerre . . . lesquels le service d'amour a faict devenir vaillans et bien morigenez.' Cf. also the many references to 'Li bon Othe de Grancon' in Christine de Pisan's poems, who was, in her own words, 'vaillant, courtois, gentil, preux, bel et gracieux', qualities which could be attributed to Gawain.

[2] Tolkien and Gordon, p. xi.

THE QUARTO COPY FOR THE FOLIO *RICHARD III*

By J. K. WALTON

I

IN a recent article A. S. Cairncross has argued that three quartos, Q1, Q3, and Q6, were used as copy for the Folio text of *Richard III*.[1] In his view the copy for F was made up of thirty-three passages of varying length each of which was taken from one or other of these quartos. The evidence which he puts forward, however, is arbitrarily and inconsistently selected, and he is often seriously inaccurate. He produces, in fact, no evidence which makes it necessary to modify the theory that F was throughout printed from Q3.[2] I give the following analysis of his article in order to substantiate these assertions.

Cairncross begins by citing what he calls 'something like the full list of readings peculiar to Q6 and F' (pp. 226–7). These consist of ten of the twelve readings which P. A. Daniel adduces to show that Q6 served as copy for F,[3] together with four others. The four which Cairncross adds are:

I. iv.	24[4]	Qq1–5	wracks	Q6F	wrackes
	237		lessond		lessoned
IV. iv.	208		vale		vaile (= veil)
	524[5]		Dorshire		Dorsetshire

By adding these to the number of Q6F readings, Cairncross tries to strengthen the case for the use of Q6 at certain points of the text. But they are quite arbitrarily chosen. The Q6F 'Dorsetshire' is an obvious correction of the Qq1–5 'Dorshire' such as might be made by any compositor or proof-reader, and is thus without any weight. Moreover, if Cairncross

[1] 'The Quartos and the Folio Text of *Richard III*', *R.E.S.*, N.S. viii (1957), 225–33.

[2] The theory I put forward in *The Copy for the Folio Text of 'Richard III'* (Auckland, 1955).

[3] See his introduction to the Griggs facsimile of Q1 (1885), pp. xii–xiii.

[4] References as in the Cambridge edition (1892). I used the Oxford facsimile of the First Folio (1902), and photographs of Qq1–6 which I was able to obtain through the courtesy of the authorities of the British Museum, the Henry E. Huntington Library, and the New York Public Library. These are (Bartlett and Pollard *Census* number, 2nd edn., 1939): Q1, Huntington 1026; Q2, B.M. 1030; Q3, Huntington 1036; Q4, B.M. 1040; Q5, New York 1053; Q6, B.M. 1059.

[5] Cairncross here gives an incorrect line-reference (534).

includes this instance of correction in Q6 and F, he should also include the other examples: 'Boare' (F Bore) in III. ii. 11, where Qq1–5 have 'Beare' ('He dreamt, the Bore had rased off his Helme'); and 'makes' in v. ii. 24, where Qq1–5 have 'make' ('True Hope is swift, and flyes with Swallowes wings, / Kings it makes Gods, and meaner creatures Kings'). Both of these, however, unlike 'Dorsetshire', occur in passages where Cairncross wants us to believe Q1, and not Q6, copy was used. Again, he includes in his list the simple Q6F sophistication 'lessoned', but omits, for example, the Q6F sophistication 'lowr'd' in I. i. 3, where Qq1–5 have 'lowrd'. This, too, is in a passage for which he claims Q1 was used. By what process, we may also ask, does he include the Q6F agreements in spelling, 'wrackes', where the difference from Q1 consists merely in the addition of an *e*, and 'vaile', a common form of the period,[1] but exclude others—for example, 'young' (Qq1–5 yong) in II. ii. 121, another place where he claims Q1, and not Q6, served as copy. The truth of the matter is that all the four instances which he adds to make up his 'full list of readings peculiar to Q6 and F' are trifling and without any weight; but since he included them he should also have included others of the same kind which are less convenient for his theory.

The inconsistency of Cairncross's selection of evidence is still more glaring when he goes on to claim (p. 227) that the occurrence of Q6F readings in groups 'persists when the inquiry is extended to the Q6 variants which are not exclusive but originated in Qq2–5, and could, of course, have got into F by way of Q6'. Of these there are, he says, 'about eighteen'. This is a gross underestimate. If, unlike Cairncross in his list of readings peculiar to Q6 and F, we limit the count to verbal variants, and if, also unlike him, we exclude obvious corrections, we find that there are in all thirty-two,[2] which are evenly distributed throughout the text. Moreover, his eighteen are a very curious collection. He includes, for example, an obvious correction ('makes' to the imperative 'make', I. iv. 247); a frequent spelling variant (Q1 'stroke'; Qq2–6 and F 'strooke', I. i. 92); and the two lines, I. i. 101–2, first found in Q2. He even includes two instances where the reading does not occur in Q6 (Q3–5 and F 'it is', IV. ii. 82; Q3–4 and F 'manner person', III. v. 108). On the other hand he does not mention the following. In each case I give, firstly, the reading of the preceding quarto and, secondly, the reading common to the Folio and the quarto into which the reading was first introduced.

First introduced into Q2: troth / truth, I. ii. 73; my / mine, I. iv. 22; my / mine, 23; me thoughts / me thought, 58; moe / more, IV. iv. 199.

[1] It is given in *O.E.D.*

[2] Eleven among the eighteen readings cited by Cairncross, together with the twenty-one given below which he ignores.

First introduced into Q3: was man / man was (F Man was), I. ii. 195; Lo: / Lord,[1] I. iii. 321; *Ri.* / *Clo.* (F *Gloster*), 323 S.D.; I / we, I. iv. 100; to / too, II. iv. 35; talkt / talke, III. ii. 93; wisedomes / wisedome (F wisdome), III. vii. 40; her / his, 125; are / be, IV. iv. 93; nights / night, 118; daies / day, 118; would I / I would, 268; sometimes / sometime, 274; *King.* / *om.*, 365.

First introduced into Q5: 2 / 1, I. iv. 162;[2] in / with, IV. iv. 392.

Cairncross thus totally ignores twenty-one verbal variants. Moreover, the majority of the variants which he ignores occur in passages where he claims Q1 was used: see I. ii. 73; I. iv. 58; I. ii. 195; I. iii. 321; 323 S.D.; I. iv. 100; II. iv. 35; III. ii. 93; III. vii. 40; 125; IV. iv. 93; I. iv. 162. Had he taken into account the two passages, III. i. 1–166 and V. iii. 48 ff., where the correction of the quarto copy was very slight and evidence for the use of Q3 exceptionally strong, his list would have been still further substantially increased. Since he later argues that Q3 was not used throughout these two passages, he should in fact have treated them like the rest of the text and taken them into account.

Cairncross next argues that Q1 was used as copy in the passages where, according to him, there are no Qq2–6 and F agreements. He claims (pp. 227–8) that 'corroboration for this idea comes from the occurrence of Q1F errors, and Q1F mechanical variations from all the other quartos'. He holds that 'the outstanding error of this kind' is ' "hopst" (F hop'st) at IV. iv. 45, where Qq2–6 read, correctly, "holp'st" '. This is another mis-statement: 'hopst' is the reading of Q2 as well as Q1. But even if we leave Q2 out of account and treat the reading as exclusive to Q1 and F, coincidence in error of a simple kind, such as the omission of a letter, is often found to arise independently.[3] The following are examples:

Hamlet, I. v. 43, Q4 and F2, 'witchraft' for 'witchcraft'.

Romeo and Juliet, II. vi. 23, Q4F, 'else in' for 'else is'; V. iii. 204, Q5F, 'misheathed' for 'missheath'd'.

Richard II, I. iii. 29, Q5F, 'formerly' for 'formally'.

Othello, I. iii. 107, Q3F, 'over' for 'overt'.

Cairncross proceeds to claim that Q1F agreements in defective and erroneous punctuation and speech-prefixes 'may be picked up almost at

[1] The Q3F 'Lord' is a mistaken expansion of 'Lo:', which in the context must be an abbreviation of 'Lords': see *The Copy for the Folio Text*, p. 40.

[2] '1' is a correction of an error (see ibid., p. 56) and so probably is 'with' in IV. iv. 392 (ibid., p. 18). I have included them both in this list since they are not, however, obvious corrections.

[3] There is also, of course, the possibility that 'hopst' is a common error originating in the prompt-book.

random'. The examples of Q1F speech-prefixes, in the form he gives them, are as follows:

I. iii. 151 Q1F *Qu.* Qq3–5 *Q.M.* Q6 *Qu.Mar.* Camb. *Q.Eliz.*
309 Qq1–5 *Qu.* Q6 *Hast.* F *Mar.* *Q.Eliz.*
IV. i. 90 Q1F *Dor.* (*Dors.*) Qq2–6 *Qu.* (proved wrong by l. 91).

'*Qu.*', however, is consistently used throughout the quartos and also the Folio as the speech-prefix for Queen Elizabeth. In the first two cases Q1 and F have thus the correct form. The remaining Q1F speech-prefix which he cites (IV. i. 90) is the only possible case in the whole play of an erroneous speech-prefix exclusive to Q1 and F, and even it has been accepted by most editors.

Cairncross's selection 'almost at random' of 'defective and erroneous' punctuation in Q1 and F hardly inspires more confidence. He gives five examples, all consisting of the lack of a question-mark at places where he states Qq2–6 or Qq3–6 possess one (I. ii. 119; 144; 199; I. iii. 98; IV. v. 8). He is incorrect in stating that in I. ii. 199 Qq2–6 have a question-mark; this line in Qq2–6 is in the form of a statement, not a question. Moreover, throughout the entire text there are only five other cases where Q1 and F require a question-mark which is in Q3 (see III. v. 46; III. vii. 223; 242; IV. iii. 24; IV. iv. 420), and of these IV. iv. 420 occurs in a passage where he holds Q3 was the copy. There are no other errors of punctuation exclusive[1] to Q1 and F. The existence of a few instances of the lack of a question-mark in Q1 and F is not surprising when we remember that Q1 and F each lack a large number of them. There are about eighty instances where Q1 requires a question-mark and where Q3 (and Q6) possesses one. There are nineteen instances where F requires a question-mark and where all three quartos, Q1, Q3, and Q6, have one;[2] so on whatever theory we adopt F must often have failed to follow copy in this respect.[3]

After referring to some readings which he thinks suggest the use of Q3 in the parts of F formerly thought to have been printed from Q6,[4] and the use of Q1 in a part of III. i. 1–166 and a part of V. iii. 48 ff.,[5] Cairncross proceeds (p. 229) to 'an examination of the first four pages of Q in their relation to F' in order to show that here Q1 and Q6 were used alternately.

[1] A number of those given above—I. iii. 98; III. vii. 223; 242; IV. iv. 420; IV. v. 8—are exclusive to Q1F only if we leave out of account Q2.

[2] See I. iii. 30; 33; 295; I. iv. 1; 85; 100; 126; 251; 265; II. ii. 4; 35; II. iv. 26; III. iv. 64; 77; III. v. 37; IV. ii. 121; IV. iii. 27; 28; IV. iv. 264.

[3] In eighteen instances F, but not Q1, lacks a question-mark in passages where Cairncross claims that Q1 served as copy: see I. iii. 30; 33; 295; I. iv. 1; 85; 100; 126; 251; 265; II. i. 136; II. ii. 4; 35; II. iv. 26; III. iv. 64; 77; III. v. 37; IV. iii. 27; 28.

[4] Qq3–4 and F manner / Qq1–2, 5–6 maner of, III. v. 108; Q3F I burie (F bury) / Qq1–2 I buried / Qq4–6 Ile burie, IV. iv. 423.

[5] Variants at III. i. 29 and V. iii. 221. I discuss these below, pp. 134–5.

The following, in the form he himself presents them, are the readings he gives:

A2	1. i.	1	Q1F	our	Q6	*omits*
		8		measures		pleasures
		10		in stead (steed)		instead
		14		shapte (shap'd) for		sharpe of
		21		scarse		*omits*
		48		Godfathers		good fathers
		51		whats (what's)		what is
		52		I know		I doe know
A3		65	Q6	tempts . . . *omits*	Q1	tempers
			F	tempts . . . harsh		
		71	Q6	is . . . secur'd		is . . . is securde
			F	is . . . secure		
		92	Q6F	strooke		stroke
		101–2		2 *lines*		*omits*
		124		this		the

He argues that 'the line of separation here is quite clear-cut. In A2, F agrees with Q1 against Qq2–6 even to minute details (except that "inductious" is altered to "inductions").' He holds that 'on a theory of Q6 copy' the corrector of the copy for F 'must have corrected most meticulously here. . . . In A3, on the other hand, where F could not have been printed from Q1—since it retains Q6 erroneous variants—there is hardly a sign of correction from manuscript, and no agreement with Q1 against Q6.' These assertions are all unfounded. In the first place, Q3[1] agrees with five out of the eight Q1F readings which Cairncross gives for A2: 1. i. 8; 10; 14; 48 (Q3 godfathers); 52. On 'A3',[2] Q3 agrees with four of the five Q6F readings: 1. i. 65 (Q3 temps); 92; 101–2; 124. On the theory that F was printed throughout from Q3, all we have to assume, therefore, is that the corrector added 'our' in 1. i. 1, 'scarse' in 21, and changed 'is securde' to 'secure' in 71.[3] (The change from 'what is' to 'what's' in 51 is one of a kind often made by the F compositor, B.) Since on any theory of the copy for F the corrector must be assumed to have made a great number of changes and additions to the quarto copy, there is no difficulty whatever

[1] Other quartos besides Q3 agree with Cairncross's Q1F readings, but to show that his statement about F agreeing with Q1 against Qq2–6 'even to minute details' is incorrect, it is sufficient to cite the Q3 agreements with the Q1F readings which he quotes.

[2] In referring to 'A2' and 'A3', I refer only to the part of the text covered by these leaves in Q1 (1. i. 1–64 and 1. i. 65–140), and not, of course, to the actual Q1 leaves. Although the text in Q3 and Q6 also begins on A2, these quartos differ from Q1 in the number of lines per page.

[3] Cairncross (p. 229) describes the F version of l. 71—'By heauen, I thinke there is no man secure'—as an obvious botch. It gives, however, excellent sense, and is a good correction of the clumsy Qq1–3 'By heauen I thinke there is no man is securde'.

in supposing that he made these alterations at I. i. 1, 21, and 71. Even on Cairncross's own theory that Q1 copy was used for the part of F covered by A2, the corrector must have made five or six corrections of substantive readings.[1] On his theory that Q6 copy was used for the part covered by 'A3', the corrector must have made something approaching ten corrections:[2] the statement that here 'there is hardly a sign of correction from manucript' is altogether incorrect. Moreover, Cairncross is able to make his claim that a change of copy took place at the end of $A2^v$ only by ignoring Q3. The readings on which, presumably, he bases this conjecture are the last Q1F agreement he quotes for $A2^v$—'I know'—and the first Q6F agreement on 'A3'. Both of these are the Q3 readings (except that Q3 omits the second *t* in 'tempts'). Once again all we have to do is assume the use of Q3 copy throughout.

An examination of the readings which Cairncross does not here quote throws further light on the unreliability of his presentation of evidence. We have seen how, in his list of Q1F and Q6F agreements in the parts of the text covered by 'A2' and 'A3' respectively, he has included agreements in 'accidentals' and in corrections of obvious errors. He should, therefore, in accordance with the most elementary principles of presenting evidence, have quoted also instances of the same kind which tell against his theory—especially when he claims of the first of the passages, 'A2', that 'F agrees with Q1 against Qq2–6 even to minute details'. Adopting Cairncross's own standards, we find the following agreements of Q3 and F against Q1 in the part of the text covered by 'A2':

I. i. 7	Q3F alarums (F Alarums)	Q1 alarmes
10	in stead	in steed
10	steeds (F Steeds)	steedes
28	proue	prooue
30	proue	prooue
39	prophesie (F Prophesie)	Prophecy
40	murtherer	murtherers
41	Here (F here)	Heere
42	guard	gard
43	*Cla.*	*Clar.*
45	conuey	conuay
50	christned (F Christned)	christened

[1] I give the Q reading first: loue / Lute, I. i. 13; spie / see, 26; *with a gard of men / and Brakenbury, guarded*, 42 S.D.; shalbe / should be, 50; for / but, 52; Haue / Hath, 61. I omit obvious corrections.

[2] ye / you, 74; was to her for his / was, for her, 75; this / our, 83; his / your, 87; he / to, 100; I beseech / I do beseech, 103; or / or else, 115; Eagle / Eagles, 132; While / Whiles, 133; prey / play, 133; this / that, 138. A few of these may have been introduced by the compositor, but the majority must have been made by the collator with reference to his manuscript.

53	do	doe
56	wizard (F Wizard)	wisard
60	toyes	toies
61	highnesse (F Highnesse)	highnes

In estimating the worth of Cairncross's claim that in 'A2, F agrees with Q1 against Qq2–6 even to minute details' we should also take into account the fact, mentioned above, that Q3 agrees with five of the eight Q1F readings which he himself cites.

The following are instances in the passage covered by 'A3', in which Q3 agrees with F against Q6, the quarto which Cairncross claims was there used:

1. i. 73	Q3F Shore (F *Shore*)	Q6 *Shoare*	
76	Humbly	Humble	
76	complaining	complayning	
80	liuery (F Liuery)	liuerie	
127	thankes	thanks	
138	newes (F Newes)	neewes	

On the basis of the evidence he has so far adduced, Cairncross claims (p. 230) that 'it will now be simplest to take Q1 as the normal copy for F in the so-called Q6 sector, and to indicate departures from Q1'. What he calls 'the second non-Q1 passage' is 1. ii. 225–1. iii. 22, and this 'proves to be from Q3, not Q6, and covers signature B3'. The passage does not, however, cover B3 in either Q3 or Q1, being sixteen lines too few to fill a leaf in Q3, and fourteen too few to fill one in Q1; it begins at the top of $B3^{r}$ in Q3 and ends at the bottom of $B3^{v}$ in Q1. Moreover, here again he does not cite a number of readings—in this case Q1F and Q6F agreements[1]—which do not suit his theory. These agreements are, it is true, of no weight, but they are of the kind on which he bases the greater part of his conjectures. His case that Q1 was used up to 1. ii. 224 is supported only by the Q1F agreement 'said' (F saide) in line 224, where Q3 has 'sayd'. His claim that at 1. iii. 23 there was a return to Q1 is supported only by the Q1F 'arrogance' in line 24. This is clearly superior to 'arrogancie' of Qq3–6, which is a compositor's clumsy expansion. We may therefore take it that the F reading represents a correction of Q3 by the collator of the F copy.

What Cairncross describes as 'the third non-Q1 passage' is 1. iv. 13–27, where he argues Q6 served as copy. These fifteen lines occupy the middle of $C4^{r}$ in Q6.[2] The following are the only readings he cites where F agrees

[1] See, for example, Q1F findes / Q3 finds, 1. ii. 253; Q1F shadow (F Shadow) / Q3 shaddow, 263; Q1F cheere / Q3 cheare, 1. iii. 5; Q6F humour / Q3 humor, 1. ii. 227; Q6F Looking-glasse / Q3 Looking glasse, 255.

[2] Cairncross (p. 231) says that 'before and after this passage, F is clearly derived from Q1 or Q3'—he does not seem sure which.

with Q6 against Q3 (he is incorrect in stating that Q3 has no brackets in l. 19):

I. iv. 13	Q6F there (F There)	Q3 thence
19	Strooke	Stroke
22	water	waters
24	wrackes	wracks

Here again Cairncross includes trifling agreements in spelling. He fails to give a Q3F agreement against Q6, where there is variation in the form of the word and not merely in spelling—Q3F 'toward'; Q6 'towards' (I. iv. 13). The other Q6F variants, 'water' and 'there', are included in Daniel's list of 'exclusive' Q6F readings. As I have elsewhere pointed out,[1] there are seventeen substantive readings 'exclusive', in the same sense, to the post-Folio quarto, Q7 (1629)—a considerably greater number than there are 'exclusive' to Q6 and F. In the other post-Folio quarto, Q8 (1634), there are about the same number (ten) as in the case of Q6.[2] All these instances in Q6, Q7, and Q8 are indifferent variants similar in sense (and often in form) to the reading for which they are substituted. In neither Q7 nor Q8 are there introduced any readings other than variants of a compositorial kind—in other words there are no readings which suggest that F was consulted at any point in their printing. The number of Q6F agreements is, therefore, not greater than we should expect to find if F was not printed from Q6; and the two Q6F indifferent variants in this passage have no weight as evidence.

The two remaining passages for which Cairncross adduces evidence are those in the so-called 'Q3 sector', III. i. 1–166 and v. iii. 48 ff. The first consists of the first '38 or 39' lines of III. i, and here F was, he holds, printed from Q1. This stretch does not coincide with either the beginning or end of a page in Q1 or Q3. The following are the only readings he cites where F agrees with Q1 against Q3 (pp. 231–2):

III. i. 29	Q1F haue come	Q3 come
33	to	the
38	the	to

The Q1F readings in l. 33 and l. 38 are obvious corrections, such as any compositor would make, of glaring errors. In l. 33, Q3 has 'Perswade the Queene thesend the Duke of Yorke', and in ll. 37–38 'if my weake oratorie / Can from his mother winne to Duke of Yorke'. The remaining Q1F agreement, 'haue come' in l. 29, makes the line metrically regular and is clearly correct. It may have been made by the F compositor or, more probably,

[1] *The Copy for the Folio Text*, pp. 29–32.
[2] See ibid., pp. 32–34.

by the F collator.[1] Cairncross goes on to claim (p. 232) that 'lines 1–38 . . . would require meticulous correction, even to the spelling, of variants in which there is no obvious error, on a theory of Q3 copy. Assume Q1 copy, and consistency is restored.' To show how unfounded is this claim, I give below a collation of all verbal variants, together with all spelling variants, in all cases in ll. 1–38 where Q3 differs from Q1 and F agrees with one or the other. I omit the three variants quoted above.

	Q1 *young*	Q3 *yong*	F *yong*
III. i. S.D.			
3	weary	wearie	wearie
5	heauy	heauie	heauie
7	Sweete	Sweet	Sweet
14	poison	poyson	poyson
16	*Pri.*	*Prin.*	*Prin.*
16	wer	were	were
17	Lo	Lord	Lord
24	here	heere	heere
24	Lo:	Lord	Lord
28	sanctuary	Sanctuarie	Sanctuarie
31	peeuish	peenish	peeuish
37	oratory	oratorie	Oratorie

It will be seen that in all cases but one (l. 31) F agrees with Q3 against Q1. These include the Q3F 'heere' in l. 24, where the F compositor (A) went against his normal spelling, which is that of Q1.[2]

The other supposed Q1 passage is v. iii. 204–21. This likewise does not coincide with either the beginning or end of a page in Q1 or Q3. Cairncross cites the following Q1F and Q3 variants:

	Q1F had	Q3 *om.*
v. iii. 204	murtherd (F murther'd)	murthred
217	stroke	strooke
221	ease dropper (Q1) Ease-dropper (F)	ewse-dropper

Of these, 'had' and 'Ease-dropper', both of which occur near a stage direction (at l. 207 and l. 222 respectively), can best be explained as the result of desultory correction by the F collator. There is reason to believe that in v. iii. 48 ff. the collator concentrated on correcting stage-directions and such nearby variants as happened to catch his attention.[3] The other

[1] See ibid., p. 115.

[2] Cairncross also remarks in regard to this passage that 'it may be noted, further, that the Q speech-prefix *Glo.*, which is replaced everywhere else in F by an abbreviation of *Richard*, begins after line 40 (at 63) and ends at 154; the previous examples (lines 2, 7, 17) following the usual F form *Rich.*'. But the change from *Rich.* to *Glo.* at this point is clearly the result of a change of compositors: see *The Copy for the Folio Text*, pp. 98–99.

[3] Ibid., pp. 108–24.

readings, at l. 204 and l. 217, are common variations of spelling. The following are Q3F agreements against Q1, agreements which Cairncross once again ignores:

v. iii. 203	Q3F	pittie	Q1	pitie
206		To morrowes		To morrows
209		early		earlie
211		friends (F Friends)		friendes
221		play		plaie

These five passages are the only ones Cairncross examines in any detail; he merely gives line-references for the twenty-eight remaining passages. In regard to the thirty-three passages as a whole he claims (pp. 232–3) that the theory that 'the corrector tore out and worked with separate leaves of all or any of the quartos' is supported by the fact that 'most of the departures from Q1 copy coincide with the beginning or ending of a page of one or other of the quartos'. This statement about the supposed departures from Q1 copy is, however, not borne out by the line-references which he himself gives for the passages. There are altogether fifteen passages where he claims Q1 was used,[1] and there are thus fifteen places in all where a departure from Q1 to Q3 or Q6 copy is supposed to have taken place. In nine of these fifteen cases the supposed point of departure does not coincide with either the beginning or end of a page in Q1, or with the beginning or end of a page in the quarto to which the change is supposed to have been made.[2] Further investigation shows that in seventeen out of the twenty-nine cases where a change is supposed to have been made to and from Q1 copy, it does not correspond with the beginning or end of a page in Q1 or in the other quarto concerned.[3] If we take Q1 by itself, we find that apart from the first passage—which occurs at the beginning of the play—there is out of fourteen instances only one (I. iii. 23–328) where the supposed Q1 passage begins and ends with the beginning and end of a Q1 page. In the case of Q3 and Q6 there is not a single instance out of the eighteen where Cairncross claims Q3 or Q6 served as copy in which the Q3 or Q6 passage coincides with the beginning and end of a page in whichever of these two quartos he supposes to have been used. These facts of themselves make the three quarto theory highly improbable.

Cairncross also argues that 'most of the departures from Q1 copy' coincide 'with difficulty in the copy because of heavy correction or the need

[1] Taking it that F in the passages before and after I. iv. 13–27 was, in his view, printed from Q1.

[2] See I. iv. 233; III. i. 40; III. iv. 106; III. v. 73; IV. ii. 77; IV. iv. 110; 198; V. iii. 47; 221.

[3] There are twenty-nine cases altogether, not thirty, since Cairncross holds that the first passage in the play was printed from Q1. The seventeen are made up of the nine cited in the previous note, together with the following: I. iv. 28; 248; III. vii. 1; IV. iii. 6; IV. iv. 242; 288; IV. v. 8/17; V. iii. 202.

for restoring omitted matter, somewhere in the vicinity'. It is, however, clear that he here interprets the words 'departures from Q1 copy' freely, for the first[1] of seven examples which he gives actually occurs near the beginning of a long stretch (I. iv. 248–III. i. 40) where he holds Q1 itself was used. Since there are thirty-three passages where he claims either Q1, Q3, or Q6 was used, and since throughout the greater part of the text there is heavy alteration or insertion, we should expect that a number of the thirty-two points of supposed juncture would be 'in the vicinity'.

Finally, Cairncross totally ignores the evidence which has been adduced to show that F was throughout printed from Q3. He says nothing of the twenty-two verbal variants[2] which are 'exclusive' to Q3 and F when we leave out of account subsequent quartos, as he himself does in the case of Q6. At least seven—eight when we include IV. iv. 365—are definite errors, and these eight errors are evenly distributed throughout the five-sixths of the text where F has until recently been thought not to have been printed from Q3: three in Act I, two in Act II, one in Act III, and two in Act IV. He also ignores the evidence of various kinds which has been put forward to show that Q6 was not used, evidence which includes the fact that there is no definite error in F which originated in Qq4–6. In a note elsewhere,[3] however, in which he criticizes Sir Walter Greg's acceptance of the theory that F was throughout printed from Q3,[4] he tries to discredit the evidence provided by the post-Folio quartos, Q7 and Q8, regarding the amount of coincidence in substantive readings which we might expect to find between the Folio and a quarto from which it was not printed. He thus claims that *Hamlet* 1637, which was printed from the preceding quarto but which to some extent depends on the Folio, is a 'typical example' of post-Folio quartos, and he suggests that agreements between F of *Richard III* and Q7 and Q8 respectively likewise arose through consultation of the Folio. A study of the quartos as a whole shows that so far from *Hamlet* 1637, with its dependence on F, being a 'typical example', it is unique—except, of course, for the generally recognized case of *Othello* 1630.[5]

II

Another theory of the copy for F *Richard III* has recently been proposed by Silvano Gerevini,[6] who claims that Q6 was used alternately with Q3.

[1] The crux in which Clarence pleads with the murderers (I. iv. 257–65).

[2] For the twenty-two verbal variants see *The Copy for the Folio Text*, pp. 35–41. To these I would add the Qq3–6 and F omission of a speech-prefix at IV. iv. 365—a definite error.

[3] 'Coincidental Variants in *Richard III*', *The Library*, 5th ser., xii (1957), 187–90.

[4] *The Library*, 5th ser., xi (1956), 125–9.

[5] A study which I have made of the quartos as a whole is awaiting publication.

[6] In *Il Testo del Riccardo III di Shakespeare* (Pavia, 1957).

He bases his theory on an examination of only fifteen complete quarto pages[1] out of a total of ninety, and these fifteen are arbitrarily chosen except that about half (8) occur in parts of the text set by the F compositor B, and the rest, with one exception,[2] in those set by A. His method is to give a collation of Q3, Q6, and F variants, which he considers under different headings: italics, initial letters, punctuation, and verbal and spelling variants. On the general impression he receives, he proceeds to say which quarto served as copy: of the fifteen pages he allots six to Q3, four to Q6, while about five he is uncertain.[3]

This method is invalid because it is entirely subjective. Gerevini makes no attempt to demonstrate that any of the readings where F agrees with one of the quartos represents a deviation from the normal practice of the F compositor. He cites Q6F agreements in roman and italic without attempting to set aside evidence which has been adduced to show that neither compositor A nor B introduces an abnormal form in any case where Q6, but not Q3, is abnormal from the viewpoint of A and B's respective practices.[4] His Q6F agreements in the form of initial letters all consist of instances where Q6 and F have capitals; he ignores the strong tendency of both F compositors to capitalize. The weight of his Q6F agreements in punctuation may be judged from his description of the Q6F 'empty (Q6 emptie), vast, and', where Q3 has 'emptie vast and', as 'un caso notevole' (p. 65). Nor does he attempt to show that a Q6F agreement in a substantive reading is of a kind different from what we may expect to have between F and a quarto from which it cannot have been printed. In general, although the main part of his study is devoted to 'la confutazione della recente tesi del Walton' (p. 4), he totally ignores all the various kinds of evidence which have been adduced to show that Q3 was used throughout. By employing such methods there would be no difficulty in claiming that all six pre-Folio quartos served as F copy. It is thus not surprising that, using a procedure somewhat similar to Cairncross's, Gerevini arrives at very different results. In no instance does he agree with Cairncross in the allotment of Q6 passages.[5]

[1] These are: $A2^{r}$–$A3^{v}$; $C1^{v}$–$C4^{v}$; $F2^{v}$–$F4^{r}$ (the signatures are the same for Q3 and Q6). He also examines three pages ($A4^{r}$, $C1^{r}$, $F4^{v}$) in part rather than whole 'per fare coincidere la divisione in segnature con quella in scene od entrate' (ibid., p. 47). But a division according to scene or entry of characters has, of course, no bibliographical validity.

[2] $C2^{v}$. The corresponding passage in F was set by A and B.

[3] See *Il Testo*, p. 87.

[4] See *The Copy for the Folio Text*, pp. 62–73.

[5] In a PS. (p. 97) he tells us that his work was already with the printers when he saw Cairncross's article. The pages of Q6 which Gerevini claims were used are: $C4^{v}$ ('qualche probabilità'), $A2^{v}$ ('probabile'), $A3^{r}$ and $C4^{r}$ ('abbastanza netta'). $C4^{v}$ (I. iv. 40–82) occurs within a passage (I. iv. 28–233) where Cairncross holds Q1 copy was used (as does also the part Gerevini examines of $A4^{r}$, a passage he likewise claims for Q6). $A2^{v}$ (I. i. 33–70) is mostly within another of Cairncross's Q1 passages (I. i. 1–64). $A3^{r}$ (I. i. 71–109) occurs within a passage Cairncross assigns to Q6 (I. i. 65–140), but does not agree with it in beginning or ending. $C4^{r}$ (I. iii. 354–I. iv. 39) overlaps Cairncross's I. iv. 13–27.

Dr. Cairncross writes:

It is taken for granted that the establishment of the genealogy of documents 'depends on the principle that identity of reading implies identity of origin'.[1] The only alternative is where coincidence operates. 'Accidental coincidences do occur, and have to be reckoned for: but except where an alteration is very plausible and tempting, the chances that two transcribers [and a printer is a transcriber] have made the same alteration independently is relatively small.'[1]

Mr. Walton and I disagree about what is evidential and what is coincidental. He seems to me to claim a much larger field for coincidence than is justified by the common experience of editors. Generally, he assumes coincidence without first discounting all the possibilities of common origin; in effect, he begs the whole question of coincidence.

Mr. Walton finds that were I consistent in my listing of variants I should have included many I seem to have ignored. In presenting a view of the genealogy of the F text of *Richard III*, however, I did not propose to give an exhaustive list of variants. I grouped around the evidential variants a number of others that may in themselves be doubtful, giving them a value they would not have individually, and helping to define the extent of the stint derived from a particular quarto. Those who are interested must judge whether my main variants are evidential,[2] and whether Mr. Walton's lists invalidate my argument. The net result, to my mind, is that when my method is understood and allowed for, the general case is undisturbed, and Mr. Walton's lists irrelevant; though he has enabled me to make a few corrections[3] and adjustments of detail.[4]

Against his argument that F comes entirely from Q3, I offer meantime only one comment. The F text of Act II, where it follows a quarto, is identical with Q1 throughout.[5] The formula *Q1F* appears regularly in the collation of Clark and Wright; *Q3F* does not occur. There is nothing here that can be shown to have come from Q3, and much that cannot have come from it. It may be said that here the F corrector (of Q3) was particularly vigilant—so vigilant that he left no trace of his copy. His vigilance must, in that case, have been quite uncharacteristic, in view of his acknowledged negligence in the remainder of the text. It must also have been of a peculiarly selective kind, for, at the same time, he left standing, as is now

[1] Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London, 1881), ii. 46.

[2] One is discussed in detail in *The Library*, 5th ser., xii (1957), 187–90; with which compare Mr. Walton's reply, 5th ser., xiii (1958), 139–40.

[3] Particularly the first variant in footnotes 6 and 7 on p. 227, which should be omitted; as also the second example at I. iv. 19 (p. 231).

[4] E.g. the extension of stint 5 to I. iv. 273 or 281 (p. 231).

[5] Apart from the natural 'Last night I heare / heard', II. iv. 1, and 'go to / too . . . too', II. iv. 35. I omit obvious spelling corrections, and take no account here of Q6.

recognized,[1] a number of errors present in *all* the Q editions. In other words, he chose to correct just those readings, and no others, in which Q_3 had diverged from Q_1, while he left uncorrected just those readings in which Q_3 agreed with Q_1. All this would be coincidence indeed. It is, of course, possible; but is it probable? Is it not rather simpler and more probable to suppose that identity of reading implies identity of origin?

[1] See J. Dover Wilson, *Richard III* (New Shakespeare), p. 157.

WHAT WAS THE SOUL OF THE APPLE?

By W. A. MURRAY

For to chuse, is to do....

SINCE Donne added his mocking preface and discarded his unfinished first poem on the *Progresse of the Soule* it has received scant attention and less approval. Amongst this chorus of distaste, the solitary voice of De Quincey[1] seems little more than an eccentricity. Yet, although the poem is neither very good nor of much literary importance, it is by no means negligible for other reasons. It is the product of an important chapter in Donne's intellectual life; it is also not without interest to the historian of ideas.

The date of *The Metempsychosis* is established by Donne himself as 16 August 1601.[2] It falls therefore within the crucial period of his private life, the months which preceded his marriage. This is a fact of the first importance for our understanding of the poem. During the preparation for the decision which he had to make, he must have thought intensely about a variety of problems connected with his own situation. What then more natural than to write of choice itself, of the earthly progress of the soul from one dilemma to another?

I interpret *The Metempsychosis* as the result of his reactions to his own dilemma. It is an embryo Fall-poem, different in style and method from later developments of a similar theme in the *Anniversaries*. It is Donne on the subject of *Paradise Lost*, characteristically finding his symbols in the attempt of Philo Judaeus to allegorize the story of Genesis.

The Philonic element in this poem has not been sufficiently emphasized by scholars. Philo[3] as originator of a philosophical trend which leads through the Fathers of the Church to Thomas Aquinas has an obvious relevance to our study of Donne. He was a Jew, a contemporary of Christ, whom Christianity eventually almost adopted as its own.[4] He was a

[1] *Works*, ed. Masson (London, 1897), x. 100: 'Massy diamonds compose the very substance of his *Metempsychosis*, thoughts and descriptions which have the fervent and gloomy sublimity of Ezekiel or Aeschylus.'

[2] H. J. C. Grierson, *Donne's Poems* (Oxford, 1912), ii. 218 ff.

[3] Philo Judaeus, *c.* 20 B.C.–post A.D. 40, Alexandrian philosopher and chief exponent of Hellenistic Judaism. The translation I have used in this article is that of the Loeb Classical Library, and the commentary to which I am chiefly indebted is that of H. A. Wolfson (Cambridge, Mass., 1948).

[4] Philo is a well-established part of the Christian tradition, having influenced Origen, and St. Jerome, whose *Onomasticon* even appears in the same volume as *Quaestiones in Genesim*, and *Liber Antiquitatum* (of ps.-Philo), to which I refer below. *Onomasticon* concerns itself with the allegorical interpretation of Hebrew names, e.g. *Cain* is 'possession'.

R.E.S. New Series, Vol. X, No. 38 (1959)

preacher, an eclectic philosopher, and a polymath. Donne's generation had an urge to reinvestigate the origins of their thinking, particularly in the domain of theology. Both Reformation and Renaissance contribute to a Philonic influence in European thought evident in the edition of Philo's *Quaestiones in Genesim* published by Budaeus in 1527, in the French translation of Philo's works by P. Bellier (1575), and in the Latin translation by Sigismundus Gelenius (1613). In these, the original texts of Philo, with some now recognized as spurious, were made available to a wide public, which could make direct contact with his ideas, not merely with the Philonic elements in the traditional philosophers, and in theologians such as St. Jerome.

Donne apparently did not rate Philo very highly, if we are to take his epigram *On an Obscure Writer* at its face value:

> Philo, with twelve yeares study, hath beene griev'd
> To be understood; when will hee be beleev'd?

Certainly there are few traces of reminiscence or reference, although the fact of Donne's familiarity with the manner of allegorical interpretation is proved by a passage in the letters.[1] It may be, too, that Donne's style of preaching owes something to Philo. The evidence, such as it is, would be covered without difficulty by assuming that Philo was a part,[2] possibly for a time an important part, of the theological inquiries which had their practical issue in Donne's choice of the Reformed religion.

While Philo, the assured believer in God, who was at the same time convinced of the philosophical consistency of the Pentateuch, is of obvious interest for anyone with Donne's religious problems, Philo the ascetic and preacher of asceticism has a special relevance to Donne in his year of crisis. Difficulties of decision about marriage, about the relationship of the sexes, are in themselves sufficient to explain the ironic mood, the bitter comments on Woman, the wry-mouthed humour of the poem. They may also partly account for the presence of the Philonic element. Although we know what was the outcome of Donne's agony of choice, and may guess how much more attractive to him would be a view of sex like that of Paracelsus, which emphasizes again and again the essential complementariness of Man and Woman, it seems quite reasonable to suppose that the stress of this period could create moods of ironic questioning in which an ascetic tendency was latent, and the Philonic associations in consequence more natural.

The interpretation of *The Metempsychosis* has hitherto been dominated

[1] E. Gosse, *Life and Letters of John Donne* (London, 1899), i. 177.

[2] Philo was a fashionable interest in Britain as well as on the Continent. James VI possessed an edition, or rather a French translation; see J. Craigie, *Poems of James VI of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1955), p. xix.

by two biographical suppositions, neither of which has much supporting evidence. The first is that it was the product of Donne's Roman Catholic period. Sir Herbert Grierson in his edition of the poems says: 'Donne, who was still a Catholic in the sympathies that come of education and association, seems to have contemplated a satirical history of the great heretic in lineal descent from the wife of Cain to Elizabeth—for private circulation.'[1] The second is that the poem deals with the Essex revolt. Here the syllogism is perhaps, 'This is an obscure poem dated 1601. Everyone had to write obscurely about Essex in 1601. Therefore Donne was writing about Essex.' Professor Mahood takes this line and includes the first assumption also.[2]

It is not difficult to understand how these views arose. They combine a traditional misreading of the poem with a casual remark of Ben Jonson's to Drummond: 'The conceit of Donne's *Metempsychosis* was that he sought the soul of that apple which Eve pulled, and thereafter made it the soul of a bitch, then a she-wolf, and so of a woman; his general purpose was to have brought in all the bodies of the heretics, from the soul of Cain, and at last left in the body of Calvin: of this he never wrotte but one sheet. . . .'[3]

The tradition thus derived led Gosse to conclude: 'We have not yet advanced out of sight of the Garden of Eden, and at this rate of progress it would have taken millions of verses to get down to Queen Elizabeth.'[4] Professor Grierson remarks: 'The wit of Donne did not apparently include invention, for many episodes are pointless as well as disgusting.'[5] Such are representative opinions of those critics who have thought the poem worth noticing.

As Jonson's recollection of what Donne had written was inaccurate, his notion of its central idea may be no more than a misleading conjecture. I propose therefore to try the effect of discarding the traditional view and of applying in detail a new theory of the symbolism of the soul of the apple.

The initial step in this process is based upon internal evidence. Towards the end of the fragment some names of the children of Adam are used which do not occur in the Old Testament. All of these, except that of Tethlemite, are to be found in a history of the Jews[6] which in Donne's time was attributed to Philo Judaeus, and was bound along with the

[1] See Grierson, ii, pp. xviii ff., for the main discussion of this poem.
[2] M. M. Mahood, *Poetry and Humanism* (London, 1950), p. 106.
[3] Jonson, *Works*, ed. Herford and Simpson, i (Oxford, 1925), 136.
[4] Gosse, i. 138.
[5] Grierson, ii, p. xx.
[6] Ps.-Philo, *Philonis Iudaei Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber*, ed. Budaeus (1527), p. 1: 'Initio mundi Adam genuit tres filios et unam filiam, *Cain*, *Noaba*, *Abel*, et *Seth*: et vixit Adam, postquam genuit Seth, annos DCC, et genuit filios duodecim et filias octo: et haec sunt nomina virorum, Aeliliseel, Suris, Aelamiel, Brabal, Naat, Harama, Zasam, Maathal, et Anath: et hae filiae eius, Phua, Iectas, Arebica, *Siphatecia*, Sabaasin'; and below: 'Cain

Quaestiones in Genesim in the edition of Budaeus. In the *De Opificio Mundi* of that author, a treatise which would naturally attract a student of Genesis, occurs the following passage which seems to bear upon the symbolism of *The Metempsychosis*:

> But in the divine park or pleasaunce all plants are endowed with soul or reason, bearing the virtues for fruit, and besides these insight and discernment that never fail by which are recognised things fair and ugly, and life free from disease, incorruption and all of a like nature. This description is, I think, intended symbolically rather than literally, for never yet have trees of life and understanding appeared on earth, nor is it likely that they will appear hereafter. No, Moses evidently signifies by the pleasaunce the ruling power of the soul, which is full of countless opinions as it might be of plants; and by the tree of life he signifies reverence towards God, the greatest of virtues, while by the tree that is cognizant of good and evil he signifies the middle thought (*μέση φρόνησις*), by which things of a contrary nature are distinguished from each other.[1]

The same terminology reappears, showing further associative links with our poem, in Chapter xi of the *De Plantatione* (*Noah's Work as a Planter*):

> We need, then, be at no loss to know why there are brought into the ark, which was built at the time of the great Flood, all the kinds of wild beasts, but into the Garden no kind at all. For the ark was a figure of the body, which has been obliged to make room for the savage and untamed pests of passions and vices, whereas the garden was a figure of the virtues; and virtues entertain nothing wild, nothing (we may say outright) that is irrational.

autem habitavit in terra tremens secundum quod constituit ei Deus, postquam interfecit fratrem suum: et nomen mulieris eius *Themech*. . . .'

If we accept Moaba, in Donne's poem, as a slight error for Noaba, six out of the seven names used are to be found in this short passage of ps.-Philo, and the name Siphatecia is given in its correct order, as that of Adam's fifth daughter. This is a high degree of correspondence for lists of this kind, and is, I think, conclusive proof that Donne had as his source notes or reasonably accurate recollections of the *Liber Antiquitatum*, the ascription of which in his day was acceptable enough.

Examination of the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament has shown no forms like these except Cain, Abel, and Seth. Grierson (ii. 224) misses the name Themech in his note. L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1938, 1946–7), v. 145, n. 42, remarks: 'The fictitious names frequently found in this pseudepigraphic work and in ps.-Philo (particularly the names of the women of ancient times) are entirely unknown in the old rabbinic literature, and are only found in the writings of the Arabic period, when the Jews became more familiar with the Christian and Mohammedan pseudepigraphic writings.' 'Adam's oldest daughter, whose name has been transmitted in no less than twenty-two forms. . . .' In such circumstances the degree of correspondence between ps.-Philo and the poem is sufficient to direct our attention to the Philonic opus as a whole, from which I suppose Donne to have derived the concept of the soul of the apple.

[1] *Works*, i. 121. The same idea is also found in a passage in *Quaestiones in Genesim*, and is borrowed by an author of whom Donne was very fond, 'the divine Francis George'. The expression 'sens moral' is used as a translation of Philo's term. (See *L'Harmonie du Monde, . . . Premièrement composé en Latin par Francois Georges Vénitien, et depuis traduict et illustré par Guy Le Fèvre de la Boderie* (Paris, 1579), p. 583.)

It is with deliberate care that the law-giver says not of the man made after God's image, but of the man fashioned out of earth, that he was introduced into the garden. For the man stamped with the spirit which is after the image of God differs not a whit, as it appears to me, from the tree that bears the fruit of immortal life: for both are imperishable and have been accounted worthy of the most central and most princely portion: for we are told that the tree of Life is in the midst of the Garden (Gen. ii. 9). Nor is there any difference between the man fashioned out of the earth and the earthly composite body. He has no part in a nature simple and uncompounded, whose house and courts only the self-trainer knows how to occupy, even Jacob who is put before us as 'a plain man dwelling in a house' (Gen. xxv. 27). The earthly man has a disposition of versatile subtlety, fashioned and concocted of elements of all sorts. It was to be expected, then, that God should plant and set in the garden, or the whole universe, the middle or neutral mind, played upon by forces drawing it in opposite directions and given the high calling to decide between them, that it might be moved to choose and to shun, to win fame and immortality should it welcome the better, and incur a dishonourable death should it choose the worse.[1]

It is true that the relationship between these extracts and the poem is not one of close parallel. Yet the occurrence, in texts which we have every reason to suppose that Donne had read, of the idea of 'neutral mind' and some suggestion of the allegorical images in *The Metempsychosis* is of obvious significance. In Philo we have the Ark, the beasts, the struggle between flesh and spirit, the agony of choice; in Donne the same elements appear, varied in detail and arrangement but subtly consistent with their probable source. This is well shown by the stanza on the Ark:

> Nor, holy Janus, in whose soveraigne boate
> The Church, and all the Monarchies did floate;
> That swimming Colledge, and free Hospitall
> Of all mankinde, that cage and vivarie
> Of fowles, and beasts, in whose wombe, Destinie
> Us, and our latest nephewes did install
> (From thence are all deriv'd, that fill this All,)
> Did'st thou in that great stewardship embarke
> So diverse shapes into that floating parke,
> As have been moved, and inform'd by this heavenly sparke.

This stanza says in fact that the 'neutral mind' (which Philo saw as a basic feature of the universe) has inhabited more shapes than those that derive from the ark. (It could, for example, be said to have been present in the heavenly host when Satan rebelled, or in living things which have appeared since the Flood.) Donne concentrates upon the institutions and creatures which maintain the existence of the fallen world, and especially on the Ark as the means of physical continuity. The allegorical and

[1] *Works*, iii. 235. The last sentence describes the type-episode of *Metempsychosis*.

historical aspects of the Genesis-theme are closely intertwined in what follows, as they were in the 'double vision' of Philo himself.

It may be asked at this point what of the transmigration notion itself which might seem from the Introduction to be one of the poem's main ideas? The Pythagorean philosophy was an important element in Philo's synthesis, so much so that both Eusebius and Clement of Alexandria characterized him as a Pythagorean rather than a Platonist.[1] There is thus no real incompatibility in the coexistence of Pythagorean and Philonic elements in the same poem. None the less, I am convinced that transmigration is little more than an ingenious literary device to give some connexion between episodes in the allegory. The essential thing is not the process of metempsychosis itself but the allegorical meaning of the apple's soul which undergoes it.

This attempt to interpret the poem rests therefore on the hypothesis that it was planned as an allegory of the development of the knowledge of good and evil in mankind, the separate episodes being related both to religious or historical questions and to the circumstances of Donne's own predicament.

The method of the poem is related to Philo's as converse to proposition. Where Philo worked from the Genesis narrative, to a statement of abstract meaning, Donne states his abstract meaning as a Genesis-like narrative. His imagery has an emblematic or iconographic quality. Spiritual and mental states and events are shown as vegetables, beasts, fishes, children of Adam, and occurrences in a Genesis world. Many of these images are found in slightly different form in Donne's later poetry, and many have a currency far beyond his works, appearing for example in the iconography of Dürer,[2] and of Hieronymus Bosch,[3] whose preoccupation with the Genesis myth Fränger has recently shown.[4] His symbolism is therefore not idiosyncratic, though unusual.

Stanza 8 is an apt illustration of these wider associations and interconnexions of Donne's imagery. It is specifically Christian rather than

[1] Wolfson, *Philo*, i. 99.

[2] E. Panofsky, *Albrecht Dürer* (London, 1948), ii. 234 and fig. 179. 'Adam holds the cross because the tree which was to furnish its wood had grown from a sapling of the Tree of Life (or, according to another, less original tradition, the Tree of Knowledge) planted on Adam's grave by Seth.' The iconography of Bosch represents another arrangement of these elements, closer to the imagery of the poem. I do not suggest any connexion among the three, except that of using common material.

[3] J. Combe, *Hieronymus Bosch* (Paris, 1946), p. 68. The fruit in this picture, or something very like it, appears in an engraving of Dürer, *The Four Witches* (Panofsky, ii. fig. 97), about the iconography of which there has been much dispute. The similarity with Bosch may be held to settle the matter.

[4] W. Fränger, *The Millenium of Hieronymus Bosch* (London, 1952), *passim*. I do not regard Fränger's case for the *Millenium* as an Adamite 'altar-piece' as proved beyond doubt, but the Eden associations are obvious enough.

Philonic, yet regards Christ Himself with the double vision of history and allegory, in the manner characteristic of Philo:

> Yet no low roome, nor than the greatest, lesse,
> If (as devout and sharpe men fitly guess)
> That Crosse, our joye, and griefe, where nailes did tye
> That All, which alwayes was all, everywhere;
> Which could not die, yet could not *chuse* but die,
> Stood in the selfe same roome in Calvarie,
> Where first grew the forbidden learned tree,
> For on that tree hung in security
> This soule, made by the Maker's will from pulling free.

The symbolism of this verse is not unlike that of the plate of Dürer's *Great Passion*, *The Harrowing of Hell*. On the left of this stands Adam, holding in one hand the apple, and in the other a wooden cross over which floats the glorified cross on a banner. Here the iconography suggests that the crucifixion was implied in the first sin, and that it restored by the fate of Christ the possibility of right choice and redemption. A similar meaning, even closer to Donne, is to be found in Bosch's *Saint Jerome at Prayers*. The praying figure of the Saint lies on a round knoll, and clasps a crucifix on which the body of Christ appears in flesh-coloured miniature. Here is a symbolic Calvary to the right of which is a hollow tree trunk, while on the left, in a marshy pool, is the hollow rind of a large fruit. As Donne put it in his *Hymne to God My God, in my Sicknesse*,

> We thinke that Paradise and Calvarie,
> Christs Crosse, and Adams tree, stood in one place;
> Looke Lord, and finde both Adams met in me;
> As the first Adam's sweat surrounds my face,
> May the last Adam's blood my soule embrace.

Another image cognate with these, and sharing their quasi-historical, quasi-allegorical quality, appears in *The Litanie*:

> For that faire blessed Mother-maid,
> Whose *flesh* redeem'd us; That she-Cherubin,
> Which unlocked Paradise, and made
> One claim for innocence. . . .

In the person of Mary *the flesh* is restored to its incorrupt state before the Fall.

In her book on the *Divine Poems* Miss Helen Gardner, pursuing the traditional line of approach to the annotation of Donne, devotes a whole appendix[1] to confessing that no origin has been found for the notion of Christ's Cross and Adam's Tree standing in the same place. The icono-

[1] Donne, *The Divine Poems* (Oxford, 1952), p. 135.

graphic parallel which I have discovered occurs in a famous picture which was probably known to Donne's contemporary Fra José de Siguença of the Order of Saint Jerome, writing on Bosch in 1599,[1] and which Donne himself could perhaps have seen. Even if Donne never saw or heard of the picture, its existence shows that this particular notion was not uniquely his invention as Miss Gardner claims, and that it may have been widespread in his time.

The central position, in Donne's thought, of the historical beginning of sin and its consequence in the temporal world around us is further demonstrated in the two Anniversaries, to which *The Metempsychosis* is directly related. From *The Second Anniversary* comes the following:

> Thinke further on thy Selfe, my Soule, and thinke
> How thou at first wast made but in a sinke;
> Thinke that it argued some infirmitie,
> That those two soules, which then thou foundst in me,
> Thou fedst upon, and drewst into thee, both
> My second soul of sense, and first of growth.
> Thinke but how poore thou wast, how obnoxious;
> Whom a small lump of flesh could poison thus.
> This curded milke, this poore unlittered whelpe
> My body, could, beyond escape or helpe,
> Infect thee with Originall sinne, and thou
> Couldst neither then refuse, nor leave it now.
> Thinke that no stubborne sullen Anchorit,
> Which fixed to a pillar, or a grave, doth sit
> Bedded and bathed in all his ordures, dwels
> So foully as our Soules in their first-built Cels.
> Thinke in how poore a prison thou didst lie
> After, enabled but to suck and crie.
> Thinke, when 'twas grown to most, 'twas a poore Inne,
> A Province packed up in two yards of skinne, . . .

To these examples of recurrent images it is necessary to add one passage from *The First Anniversary*:

> (For who is sure he hath a soule, unlesse
> It see, and judge, and follow worthinesse,
> And by Deedes praise it? hee who doth not this,
> May lodge an In-mate soule, but 'tis not his.)

This is almost a description of the typical process in an episode of *The Metempsychosis*. The soul of the apple becomes incarnate, expresses itself in choice, direction, activity, and has its earthly mansion ruined by the corruption of fallen nature, a process which also follows naturally from my second quotation from Philo (above).

[1] See Fränger, p. 8; Combe, p. 18 and p. 57, n. 42.

If this 'soul of the apple' or power of moral choice is central to the argument, only a little less important are the two forces of Destiny and Law. 'Fate, which God made, but doth not controule' conditions the circumstances in which choice must be exercised: Law, of God, of Nature, of Moses, entails upon each choice its consequences.

These two conceptions appear substantially in the same form in the philosophy of Philo. For 'destiny' he uses ὀπαδός, servant or Minister of God, he also refers to the 'fixed rule of Fate', which determines the length of life. He regards the laws of God, of Nature, and of Moses as essentially expressions of the same Logos, and 'choice' as a special form of activity within this complex. Wolfson gives a thoroughly apposite summary of his views, from which I quote:

> The determination of the mind to do or not to do is thus not the result of natural causes which are 'of God' or 'according to God' and by which the unalterable laws of nature established by God in the world are operated. Such a determination by the mind is a break in the nexus of these natural laws and in the established laws of the universe even as miracles are. This power with which the human mind was endowed to choose or not to choose refers not only to the choice of good, but also to the choice of evil, even though the mind is by its very nature rational, for, as says Philo, there are in our mind 'voluntary inclinations to what is wrong'. The essential rationality of the mind does not preclude the possibility of its acting, by the mere powers of its free will, against the dictates of reason.[1]

Donne's thought seems consistent with this. As we shall see, in each episode of the poem a crucial error is followed by death from natural causes. 'Right' choice is given the rarity of the supreme miracle.

At the beginning Donne has invoked 'Destiny, the Commissary of God' in terms which reveal the autobiographical importance of his theme. He raises, only to dismiss, the ancient difficulty of reconciling God's foreknowledge with Man's free will, and the problem of the justice of the Fall and of its penalty. To question revelation in these matters is to be drowned in what he later called 'the second deluge, Heresy'. Donne's solution is consistent with Philo's and also orthodox for both the Churches. He curtails abruptly his rebellious impulse, attributing it to the corruption of original sin, in a line which recalls the text, 'If thy tongue offend thee, pluck it out.'

By stanza 12, Donne has stated the elements of his argument, Choice, Destiny, and Law, and has suggested how these three are interrelated in the history of mankind and of individuals. He then proceeds to the narrative demonstration of his thought.

[1] Wolfson, i. 431–2. The whole discussion of free will in Philo, and in Plato, is relevant to the *Metempsychosis*.

The history of the soul of the apple, in the temporal fallen world, is the history of sin accumulated upon the memory of innocence. Once Destiny has brought about the Fall, everything is corrupt, and liable to the penalty of the law of nature, death, which is also that of the moral law. The power of choice, in each predicament of its incarnations, becomes a prey to the instincts of fallen nature; in Donne's own terms, it feeds upon the (corrupt) souls of growth and sense, and is led to seek, as genuine goods, self-preservation and increase in the world of time. (Voluntary inclination to evil. The irrationality of fallen mind.)

The soul of the apple first encounters its environment as a mandrake,[1] in which it activates the soul of growth, and experiences the development of those passive sexual potentialities which belong, in the thought of Donne's time, to the lore of the mandrake. The episode of 'this living buried man' may be intended to represent, in the personal allegory, the fate of the innocent soul endowed with sexual properties, at the hands of the experienced, sinful, human being, the encounter of youthful latent sexuality with adult habits and motives. When the properties of the mandrake are exploited by Eve, the soul departs from it, having discovered that in the fallen world 'hee's short-liv'd, that with his death can do most good'. The plant which grows in the fallen world must expect its fate.

The next episode advances to the soul of sense, and to a more active stage of sexual life. Under the emblem of the sparrow,[2] bird of Venus, Donne shows the power of judgement seduced by a freedom which is licence, and lost in a consuming promiscuity, which not only destroys the body but demonstrates how necessary was the law of Moses, that first redeeming intervention of God, which set bounds to the sexual excesses of fallen nature. These stanzas have an ambiguous atmosphere of levity (or is it irony?) which I shall discuss later, when considering how seriously this poem is to be taken.

In stanza 23 the centre of interest shifts from the morals of sex to the morals of survival in a world in which life is based upon the destruction of life. The first example in this category is parallel to that of the mandrake. The Soul endowed only with the minimum property of movement in the stream, and incapable of self-protection, is devoured by the Swan,[3] that whited sepulchre of the small and weak, obedient only to the law of the jungle. Both this episode and that of the mandrake represent the circum-

[1] Gosse, i. 197. The various Biblical references to the mandrake are also relevant. It is interesting that, about this time, the American mandrake was added to the drugs used in childbirth.

[2] Cf. *An Epithalamion on the Lady Elizabeth*, stanza 1.

[3] The swan is extensively used in Bosch, occurring in the form of swan-shaped boats, floating in air, and carrying men in armour. As a royal bird, it is perhaps a symbol of power.

stances where choice is minimal: '. . . and unblam'd devoured there | All, but who too swift, too great, or well armed were.'

The next incarnation, another fish, is both somewhat larger, and, at first, somewhat luckier. 'To any new desire, Made a new prey' it goes down stream to the ocean of worldly life, beset by perils from which Destiny engineers its escape with almost diabolic ingenuity, so that it may arrive unscathed to face a more complicated choice than the embryo of stanza 23. This odyssey gives Donne the opportunity to underline the savagery of fallen nature, and its progressive degradation (stanza 26). There is an advantage in insignificance, which may prolong life, only to fail one at the crucial moment. One cannot escape the onus of choice, but how to choose between the fresh- and the salt-water factions? While the fish hesitates, it is lost:

> Exalted she is, but to the exalter's good
> As are by great ones, men which lowly stood.
> It's raised, to be the Raiser's instrument and food.

Having encountered the problems of the weak who try to preserve life in the world of this death, the soul of the apple is next involved in the experience of greatness. The emblem is Leviathan; the imagery was perhaps suggested by Donne's memories of the Essex expedition. The whole of this episode seems subtly relevant to the events of 1601:[1] the description of the growth of Leviathan would be an excellent allegory of the rise of the favourite. The law of self-preservation of greatness is increase and yet more increase, or so it seems to the aggressive great. How obviously appropriate to the political scene are these lines,

> O might not states of more equality
> Consist? and is it of necessity
> That thousand guiltlesse smals, to make one great must die?

and

> 'Tis greatest now, and to destruction
> Nearest; There's no pause at perfection:
> Greatnesse a period hath, but no station.

To be great is to be in mortal peril, but it is no safer to take envy of greatness as one's principle. The mouse, which does so, has the ironic misfortune to destroy the only harmless great thing, and in so doing to make his foe both his prey and his tomb.

The next and final series of incidents unites the themes of sexual and

[1] Donne's position as Egerton's secretary placed him so close to the heart of affairs that he must have had opportunities of knowledge, and occasions of reflection about the Essex revolt. The connexion with the *Metempsychosis*, if there is one, seems to me to be entirely indirect and general, none the less.

social morality, in the emblems of the wolf, the wolf-dog hybrid, and the ape. The wolf wishes to rule, and prey upon, the flock which Abel ('Who in that trade, of Church, and kingdomes, there, | Was the first type') protects with the aid of his bitch. The method which the wolf uses to achieve his purpose, for him an apparent good according to the law of his nature, involves a more subtle and complex evil than those to which the power of judgement has previously succumbed. Its essence is expressed in the tone of Donne's words, '. . . yet he called those | Embracements of love', a trenchant comment on the perversion of love to selfish hypocrisy, preying upon concupiscence.

The wolf having, as it were, invented hypocrisy, the wolf-dog hybrid exploits it. The evil of hypocrisy is natural to the hybrid creature: man himself is a hybrid, both animal and divine, and attempts to satisfy both natures. The symbolic duplicity of this episode leads to a new elaboration of sinful behaviour, a further extension of the possibilities of the Fall. Not just a straightforward criminal nature informed the monster, but a double hypocrisy towards wolves and sheep, and so, in this treacherous isolation, he was deceived by his own deceit, invited pursuit by guilty flight, 'And, like a spie to both sides false, he perished'.

In both these episodes the allegory has perhaps some relevance to Donne's own recent experience of life. They might be summed up as problems of an 'outsider' who seeks preferment, or of a convert within his new church. The next emblem, that of the ape, while partly of the same group, introduces further the experience of profane love, distinguished from a naïve and generalized lust by having a specific object. In pursuing the satisfaction of this desire the ape stumbles upon yet another extension of the scope of sin,

> . . . sinnes against kinde
> They easily do, that can let feed their minde
> With outward beauty.

The ape's sin against kind was of a different degree from that of the wolf. The ape crossed the gulf between animal and human, from that which is not in God's image to that which is.

The ape had sought to seduce the higher for the satisfaction of the lower; it is therefore natural that the next stage of corruption of the power of judgement should illustrate the application of this process on the highest plane. The soul's last incarnation in the poem is as Themech, through whom the incestuous race of Cain was to be perpetuated. Themech stands, as Donne makes clear, for that perpetual seduction of the higher by the lower, of man by woman, of spirit by animal, through which temporal life maintains itself, a process only to be interrupted by the virgin birth of

Christ, and His crucifixion. Is not the body on the Cross the apple restored to its tree? (*Goodfriday*: 'O Saviour, as thou hang'st upon the tree.')

It remains, finally, to consider some of the critical aspects of *The Metempsychosis*, apart from the obscurity which I have attempted to examine. The tone of the poem seems to vary from the grandiloquence of stanza 1, which is difficult to take seriously, through the genuinely impassioned

> O let me not launch out, but let me save
> The expense of brain and spirit; that my grave
> His right and due, a whole unwasted man may have

to the ironical jesting of

> Man to beget, and woman to conceive
> Askt not of rootes, nor of cok-sparrowes, leave:

It is, in fact, a fragment not of whole cloth, an experiment which its author discarded, and about which, for whatever reasons, he wove an atmosphere of deliberate mystification. It is very tempting to allow the strong influence of the tone of this poem to persuade one to accept it as 'the nadir of Donne's belief in God and Man'. Miss Mahood in her chapter on 'Donne: The Progress of the Soule' apparently does so, in a passage which shows the present state of the traditional interpretation:

> In the same spirit, Donne planned, in *The Progresse of the Soule*, to follow the transmigrations of the Pythagorean soul through many unattractive forms of life to its final sanctuary in the breast of Queen Elizabeth; and this obscure poem probably contains many now unintelligible covert slurs upon the Queen and her ministers. Beside his resentment of the Queen's treatment of Essex, Donne had another quarrel with the Court. Though he had himself ceased to be a Roman Catholic, natural tolerance, coupled with loyalty to his family and earliest friends, made him protest against the persecution of those who had kept to the older way of worship. So the tone of both *The Progresse* and *The Courtier's Library* is strongly anti-Protestant, although Donne's disillusioned frame of mind prevented his submission to either Rome or Canterbury. . . .
>
> Donne in his turn broods over the theory that a soul can pass through every kind of body, with the sardonic wit of Hamlet speculating how a king might go a progress through the guts of a beggar. There is no faith in man left in *The Progresse of the Soule*; and the scepticism of many passages, and especially of the concluding lines—
>
> > Ther's nothing simply good, nor ill alone,
> > Of every quality comparison,
> > The onely measure is, and judge, opinion

suggests little faith in anything else. Yet in one passage of this poem, which critics have called profoundly irreligious and which certainly represents the very

nadir of Donne's belief in God and man, there sounds the note of determination already heard in the third *Satire*. The lines in question refer to *The Progresse*, but they have a wider significance than their actual context; in them, Donne dimly perceives that the thirty years of life which remain to him will be one arduous struggle to recapture, in a new form, that faith which gave such conviction to his finest love poems. . . .

I think this is wrong in a number of ways. Donne was certainly tolerant, he was equally certainly, as Miss Mahood admits, not a Roman Catholic when he wrote this poem. There is no evidence to show that he ever designed 'now unintelligible covert slurs' against the Queen or her ministers, although the suggestion is from its nature beyond disproof. I doubt if the poem is so directly related to the events of 1601, or to public religious affairs. In my opinion the public and private events of 1601 set going a train of thoughts and feelings in the poet which were centred in the problem of choice. The disillusioned, mocking, even cynical, tone is proof not of lack of faith, but of acute, though sometimes grimly humorous, realization of the supreme contrast between the decisions made by fallen man and that made by Christ, the infinity of right choice.

Whether *The Metempsychosis* was intended as a public poem and was still-born, or as a private poem and failed because of the clumsiness of its structure or for some other reason, is difficult to determine. There is certainly evidence in stanza 7 of an intent to conclude the poem with Queen Elizabeth, and this I propose to examine in detail, since it is the basis of the interpretations which I regard as inadequate. If we substitute for 'soule' the *μέση φρόνησις*, or power of moral choice, stanza 7 may be paraphrased as follows:

For that great power of choice, which is now incarnate in our Queen, expressing itself in her acts, edicts, and thoughts, which control us with certainty as the moon (Diana, Cynthia, Virgin Goddess), the tide, whose story, an example of the neutral mind in operation, you will hear at the conclusion of my poem, that power of choice which Luther experienced and Mahomet (whether these chose well or ill, they still enshrined the neutral soul if only briefly) that power of choice, which by its right or wrong issue tore and mended the Empire and late Rome in its various crises, which lived when every great change came, first existed in the apple, low enough to be plucked from the fatal tree, on that first occasion when Man used his free will to choose evil.

This seems to me to make sense. One may deduce from it that the poem was not originally designed as a private one, whatever it may have become before he abandoned it. I think that stanza 7 shows that Queen Elizabeth is to this poem what Elizabeth Drury became for the Anniversaries. She is to be seen as part of the formal occasional framework within which

Donne expressed things essentially personal to himself. Stanza 7 is thus mainly elaborate compliment.

Paradoxically it is the fact that *The Metempsychosis* is unfinished, a failure, that I find to be its greatest interest. Donne was seeking a terminology, a manageable body of ideas and images in which to fix his physical, emotional, and intellectual experience. Philo turned out to have been a blind alley. Allegorical Judaism quickly lost its hold upon his imagination. He did not develop from this source the language in which he was eventually to write of the new world of his love and marriage, in images which show his imagination stirred by very different ideas.

Nevertheless there are in *The Metempsychosis* hints and foreshadowings of his future evolution. The tendency of his mind is revealed even in those very details which Grierson found pointless and disgusting, in descriptions of growth, and of physical organism, in lines such as

> And whether she leape up sometimes to breath
> And suck in aire, or find it underneath
> Or working parts like mills or lymbecks hath
> To make the water thinne, and airelike, faith
> Cares not;

His new experiences were emphasizing, as nothing can do so well as marriage, the intimate tangle of body and soul, flesh and spirit, which becomes his dominant subject.

CLARISSA RESTORED?

By M. KINKEAD-WEEKES

I

BY the third edition of *Clarissa* Richardson had added to his novel over 200 pages of text and notes. Such changes could hardly escape notice, and indeed Richardson himself, 'for the Sake of doing Justice to the Purchasers of the Two First Editions', published the new material separately in a volume of 'Letters and Passages Restored from the Original Manuscripts of the History of Clarissa'.

Later editors and critics, taking this title literally, have ignored the new material since there could be little of interest in passages which Richardson himself had cut. Where, indeed, restoration can be most clearly proved, this conclusion is the right one. (In a few instances the first edition itself mentions a cut, and other passages expand an original summary which may indicate restoration, though in the absence of any manuscript it is impossible to be sure. And none of these is significant.) But such cases are relatively few, and many of the remaining passages are by no means uninteresting. The trouble with the orthodox assumption is that the question of the effect of new material on the novel as a whole does not arise. But as soon as one asks this question, many of the new passages and notes can be seen to fall into a significant pattern. They serve to emphasize the darker side of Lovelace, to throw light on the problem of Clarissa's 'delicacy', and to underline the novel's moral teaching.

Richardson's correspondence shows how sensitive he was to criticism. *Clarissa* appeared in three parts spread over a year; the second edition of the first four volumes six months later; and a full third edition after another two years. Richardson then had ample opportunity while his novel was actually appearing for the first time, as well as between the early editions, to become acquainted with the views of his readers. And the correspondence shows how very unsatisfactory these were. Far from being shocked at the evidence of Lovelace's wickedness in the first two volumes, too many readers saw only his charm. Consequently Clarissa's 'delicacy' over his offers of marriage in volumes iii and iv was misread as prudery. Both these misreadings contributed to the sentimental outcry over the tragic ending. And the three together amounted to a distortion of the whole moral meaning of the book.

Now the relevance of these misreadings to the 'Letters and Passages' is

R.E.S. New Series, Vol. X, No. 38 (1959)

striking, and the assumption that Richardson's title is to be taken literally becomes highly questionable. We may remember that even by the time of *Grandison* he was still posing as merely the editor of genuine correspondence. It would then seem reasonable to assume that most of the new passages are not restorations at all, but changes designed to counteract a serious misreading. This receives some support as far as the second edition is concerned from an apparently unnoticed document in the Forster Collection.[1] It is a checklist of the variants between the first and second editions; and though it must have been compiled when Richardson was preparing his volume of 'Letters and Passages Restored', it does not speak of 'restorations', but of 'alteration', 'addition', 'insertion', and 'emendation'.

If most of the new material does represent not restoration but change, we are faced with the earliest example of the effect upon a novel of audience reactions in the course of publication. This also raises for editors and critics alike the problem of which state of the text to prefer.

II. *The second edition*

The clearest signs of Richardson's concern over the misreadings are the notes he added to the second edition to counteract a lack of proper attention. His art requires close reading and the ability to judge character through both the matter and the manner of 'familiar letters'. In misjudging Lovelace, contemporary readers had failed to see beneath a gay surface. In these early volumes our information about him comes from the limited knowledge of Anna and Clarissa, and is further affected by the fluctuations of Clarissa's recurrent suspicion and awakening love. But his three letters to Belford (i. 210 ff. and 249 ff.)[2] enable *us* to see him directly, and it is vitally important to seize this chance of judging him in a way from which Clarissa herself is debarred.

In contexts of prejudice and persecution, Lovelace is an attractive figure, and his gaiety and candour, his explanation of the church incident, and his account of the 'Rosebud' affair increase our sense of this. But first appearances are superficial. The letters also show that he is deliberately inflaming the Harlowes, contriving to cut off any escape to the Howes, and to enclose Clarissa in a trap from which there are only two exits—Solmes and himself. His entertainingly candid self-characterization also shows that he is moved as much by pride and revenge as by love. In his reference to 'intimacies matrimonial or equal' we have our first indication that he will marry only if he has to. Even his tenderness and generosity to his Rosebud are partly politic, and partly dependent on an appeal to his mercy

[1] Forster, xv. 2, fols. 43–44.

[2] Page references, unless otherwise stated, are to the Shakespeare Head edition (Oxford, 1930).

and an acknowledgement of his power—conditions which Clarissa is unlikely to fulfil. Beneath the surface gaiety and charm, therefore, the real significance of these letters is their revelation of Lovelace's intrigues and Clarissa's terrible danger. We do not get another direct view of Lovelace until after the 'elopement', but we have an insight which Clarissa has not, and we must cling to it through the fluctuations of her feelings.

Lady Bradshaigh is typical of the readers who saw only Lovelace's charm. Considerably, and justifiably, stung, Richardson protested:

> And did you not perceive that in the very first letter of Lovelace, all those seeds of wickedness were thick sown, which sprouted up into action afterwards in his character? . . . On this consideration it has been a matter of surprise to me, and indeed of some concern, that this character has met with so much favour from the good and virtuous, even as it stands from his two or three first letters.[1]

Into this context we may now place the two most significant notes added in the second edition. The first (ii. 23) deals with Lovelace's duplicity in urging Clarissa to take refuge with his family or with the Howes. Richardson points out somewhat acidly that Lovelace's machinations had made this impossible, and refers his readers to the first of the three letters to revive its impact upon them. The second note (ii. 168) is of considerable length, and occurs when Clarissa, expecting the worst, is about to be surprised by the truth about the Rosebud affair. At this critical point Richardson calls attention to Lovelace's bad motives (without giving credit to the good ones) and observes that he is about to reap the benefits of his policy. He goes on:

> This explanation is the more necessary to be given, as several of our readers, (thro' want of due attention) have attributed to Mr. Lovelace, on his behaviour to his Rosebud, a greater merit than was due to him; and moreover imagined, that it was improbable, that a man, who was capable of acting so generously (as they supposed) in *this* instance, should be guilty of any *atrocious* vileness. Not considering, that Love, Pride, and Revenge as he owns in Vol. 1 Letter XXXI were ingredients of equal force in his composition; and that Resistance was a *stimulus* to him.

Moreover, an examination of the second edition discloses another six notes which do not appear in the 'Letters and Passages'. Five relentlessly remind the reader that the Harlowes are puppets danced on Lovelace's strings (ii. 27, 112, 129, 272, 312). Only one clarifies a new point, confirming a strong hint that the maid Betty is using Dolly Hervey to convey 'secrets' to Clarissa (ii. 327). There can be no doubt that all these notes are direct results of Richardson's concern about the reactions of his readers.

[1] Barbauld, *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson* (London, 1804), iv. 187. Richardson to 'Mrs. Belfour', 6 Oct. 1748. Again, no date, pp. 233 ff.

In volumes iii and iv the recension continues with two more acknowledged notes, drawing attention to another crucial Lovelace letter (iii. 82), and pointing again to his devices to prevent any other refuge but himself (iii. 166). The asperity in Richardson's phrasing is unmistakable. But now many additions to the text appear. There are numerous minor changes, but the most significant are those which underline Lovelace's heartlessness. He expresses his desire that Belford should see Clarissa 'before the plough of disappointment has thrown up furrows of distress upon every lovely feature' (iii. 348). Answering Belford's plea for compassion he expands his existing comparison of taming a mistress to taming a pet by describing how 'the dear sullen one' will 'come to by degrees'. To this he adds a mock-logical argument that his cruelty to Clarissa will be no worse than that of women to pet birds, men to foxes, cats to mice (which women delight in watching), and so on (iv. 13 ff.). Later, Richardson makes him reject Belford's plea for her on the grounds of her youth, family, beauty, and fortune; turning the last of these against her, since the riches of a ruined girl may shield her from contempt (iv. 48 ff.). Again, in his conviction that once he has overcome Clarissa he can marry her at leisure, Lovelace is now made to indulge in a vivid mental vision of the scene in which his humbled and suppliant mistress will be rewarded at last by her lord and master with a promise of marriage (iv. 20 ff.). The purpose is to drive home to readers of *Clarissa* what Lovelace's heartlessness means in human terms, and to underline with powerful irony his complete failure to understand what seduction would imply for her. These passages look forward to Clarissa's famous rejection: 'the man who has been the villain to me you have been, shall never make me his wife.'

But in these volumes Richardson was faced with a new and more complicated misreading which has continued into modern times. This concerns the intricate problem of Clarissa's 'delicacy', which makes her mishandle Lovelace's offers of marriage in spite of Anna's practical advice. Aware of her resentment at being tricked away, and her desire to be reconciled with her family, and infuriated by the slender hold he seems to have on her, Lovelace sets a new trap. He assumes an extreme deference to her wishes as an excuse for not urging a speedy marriage. When he does speak it is with haltings and excuses, and when Clarissa's notions of propriety prevent her from seizing these hesitant offers, he promptly drops them. He is fully aware of the impossible situation he is creating. Twice the depth of his emotions surprises him into urgency, but by a cruel irony anger and illness make Clarissa incapable of dealing with him. It is clear that she will marry him if he will behave properly, but clear also that she is suspicious, and unwilling to modify her ideas of proper behaviour, or to act with the ardour that Lovelace demands. When, however, Lovelace

makes himself ill to test her feelings, she does give herself away, and it is plain that only his persecuting spirit and his aversion to marriage stand in his path. But Lovelace steels his heart by angry reference to Anna's stolen letters and by listening to the urgings of the prostitutes. Clarissa's prospects are delusive. In the first edition Richardson placed a note pointing out the consistency of Lovelace's behaviour with the ideas of his first letters, and to Clarissa's early opinion of him, from which 'the Coldness and Indifference . . . which he so repeatedly accuses her of, will be accounted for, more to *her* glory, than to *his* honour' (iv. 338). Lovelace is not after marriage; the instalment ends with a full-scale attempt at seduction in the 'fire-plot', and the tragedy enters its darkest phase.

Many readers cut through this complex situation with charges of prudery. The problem is not as clear-cut as the misreadings of Lovelace, and the detractors were not utterly mistaken, but they had failed to perceive the true nature of Clarissa's behaviour. For Richardson, moral analysis is complex and subtle because the implications of behaviour are very important. The smallest elements of manner, dress, and action, and the subtlest inferences from speech, are valuable guides to the state of heart and mind.[1] Clarissa is cut off from the protection and mediation of the family, and already compromised by an elopement with a man of suspect morals, so she is forced to be particularly cautious. When she demands that Lovelace approach her with 'delicacy' and 'propriety', that is, according to the normal and prescribed code of behaviour, she cannot therefore be simply dismissed as a prude. It is only by his behaviour and its implications that she can know him and judge him as a prospective husband, and marriage in Richardson's world is an extremely serious undertaking.

In ignoring all this her critics were reading superficially. But it cannot be claimed, as Richardson was later inclined to do, that this is the whole truth. Some responsibility, however small and involuntary, remains with Clarissa. There is one occasion on which her behaviour has no moral grounds, but comes from a simple failure of nerve (iii. 341), and on two other occasions, as we have seen, her failure is due to anger and illness. But on these three occasions Lovelace is sincere—if involuntarily on two of them. Clarissa *is* constitutionally incapable of adapting herself to altered circumstances, just as Lovelace is incapable of realizing what lies behind her delicacy. Without this irony the novel would be much the poorer.

When not under attack Richardson was prepared to concede this. He writes to an unknown correspondent:

> My Girl is thought overnice by many, I find; But I think I could defend her in all her Delicacies—And yet, I would that she should have some little things

[1] The Harlowes use inferences to tighten the trap inexorably on their imprisoned daughter (i. 105 ff.).

to be blamed for, tho' for nothing in her Will; and that Lovelace should have something to say for himself to himself, tho' it could not have weight to acquit him with the rest of the World.[1]

This puts the matter in its true perspective. But as the evidence of misinterpretation mounted, Richardson's attitude hardened. He inserted three more notes into the second edition to supplement the one he had thought would suffice in the first. One is inserted into a letter dealing with the first conversation between Lovelace and Clarissa at St. Albans. Richardson defends his heroine against charges of 'reserve . . . and even . . . haughtiness', and once more reproaches her critics for lack of attention. He points to the evidence of Lovelace's policy in the conversation, to Clarissa's anger at being tricked away, and refers the reader to her next letter where she parries Anna's criticism (iii. 13). The second is inserted into Lovelace's account of his first hesitant proposal, where it becomes clear that he is acting deliberately. It refers acidly to Richardson's 'regret' that 'many of the Sex . . . who on the first publication had read thus far, and even to the Lady's first escape, have been readier to censure her for overniceness . . . than him for artifices and exultations not less cruel and ungrateful, than ungenerous and unmanly' (iii. 82). The third note is added to a letter which had obviously failed to make its significance clear because Richardson had expected his readers to supply the implications for themselves (iv. 113). He also makes three textual insertions to elucidate Clarissa's motives (iv. 110–11). One explains her anger at detecting the implication behind Lovelace's reference to Lord M: 'To leave it to *me* to chuse whether the speedy Day he ought to have urged for with earnestness, should be accelerated or suspended!' Another underlines her confusion when Lovelace, after hinting at delay, becomes effusively eager for 'to-morrow'. The third inserts a plea:

> Is it not plain, my dear, that he designs to vex and tease me? Proud, yet mean, and foolish man, if so! . . . Why, why, will he take pains to make a heart wrap itself up in Reserve, that wishes only, and that for his sake as well as my own, to observe due decorum?

At the end of this letter the note again accuses the detractors of 'want of attention to the *circumstances* she was in, and to her *character*, as well as to the *character of the man she had to deal with*'. The reader, Richardson observes,

> is perhaps too apt to form a judgement in critical cases by *Lovelace's complaints of her coldness*; not considering his views upon her; and that she is proposed as an *Example*; and therefore in her trials and distresses must not be allowed to

[1] Forster Collection, xi, fol. 1, Richardson to ? (not Lady Bradshaigh; ? Aaron Hill), 10 May 1748 (only a fortnight after 1st edn., vols. iii and iv).

dispense with those Rules which perhaps some others of her Sex, in her delicate situation, would not have thought themselves so strictly bound to observe; although if she had *not* observed them, a *Lovelace* would have carried all his points.

It is one of the difficulties of 'point of view' writing that a superficial reader is tempted to adopt the ideas of one character, and fail to correct them by the greater knowledge he himself should have. Richardson was justly angry when readers adopted Lovelace's views of the heroine. But the defence is overstated. The emphasis on Clarissa as an example is heavy-handed enough, but the emphasis on her prudence is almost worse. 'What might have been' is an unprofitable critical game, but Richardson is not only speculative, he positively distorts. Had Clarissa been less delicate the crisis *might* have been precipitated, but on three occasions it would certainly have been resolved. More seriously, to concentrate on Clarissa's prudence is to obscure the deeper and more sympathetic values on which her conduct is based. And although Richardson refers to the need to consider her character, he himself ignores the incapacity to adapt herself which contributes an important element to her tragedy. In his haste to rectify an important misreading, he has made his novel seem cruder and clumsier than it really is.

Once again an inspection of the second edition reveals several notes which Richardson did not acknowledge in the 'Letters and Passages'. Six of these underline Lovelace's intrigues (iii. 128, 140, 158; iv. 118, 142, 169). One deals with the delicacy problem (iii. 262). Richardson interrupts Anna's mild criticism to observe: 'The reader who has seen his account, which Miss Howe could not have seen, when she wrote thus, will observe that it was not possible for a person of her true delicacy of mind to act otherwise than she did, to a man so cruelly and so insolently artful.' This will not do. A reader should certainly use his understanding, which is greater than that of any character. But the characters can only be judged in terms of their own knowledge at the time. Clarissa's conduct has to be defensible according to *her* awareness, not ours. Moreover, it is a feature of many of these notes that they no longer refer back to remind the reader of what he should already know, but forward, implying that the author has ceased to trust his readers to make their own discoveries. Only one note is in any sense necessary, since the evidence of Bella's responsibility for the tone of Aunt Hervey's letter is hidden until the final volume (iii. 275; cf. viii. 127).

Other changes concern Richardson's 'characteristic', that is idiosyncratic, styles—the distinguishing of various characters by recurrent phrases or habits of speech, by spelling or syntax, and so on. Sometimes comic in design, these styles nearly always serve to indicate inner truths of

character.[1] The idiosyncrasy of Lovelace's uncle is a love of 'proverbial wisdom', so marked that it is hardly possible to believe that any reader could have missed it. Yet Richardson in the second edition inserted a paragraph drawing attention to this idiosyncrasy and Lord M's reasons for it (iv. 129), and increased the number of proverbs in the letter. He also inserted an unacknowledged note drawing attention to Lovelace's habit of coining words (iv. 24). These changes again indicate a new distrust of the distinguishing powers of *Clarissa*'s readers.[2]

Two new features of the second edition remain to be mentioned. There is a marked increase in the frequency of Richardson's italics. These are a constant habit of his private as well as his public style, and though they are, of course, a device for emphasis which is useful to a didactic writer, they are also frequently dramatic, following the intonations of the speaking voice. Richardson had also used them to distinguish quotations from a correspondent. Now they are used for interjections and asides in the manner of the stage. Much of this is unnecessary, though harmless. Significantly, however, he also begins to use italics to communicate directly with the reader, breaking out of the epistolary form. Moral 'sentiments' are somewhat obviously underlined.[3] And, more significantly still, statements which have a bearing on the main misreading now also appear in differentiated type.[4] Once again it appears obvious that Richardson's changes are a direct result of his concern over the way his novel had been misread.

Finally, he inserted at the beginning of the first volume of the second edition a carefully prepared index to the entire novel. (In the third edition he removed it from this position, suspecting that it was a bad idea to give the whole plot away, but the material relating to each volume was placed at its end in the form in which it is still usually printed.) That this index was not merely for ease of reference is shown by the preamble to the second edition. Richardson hopes that it

> will serve not only for an INDEX of the principal Historical Matters, but as a RECAPITULATION, that will enable the Reader, without anticipating Events, to enter into the succeeding Volume with the Attention that is bespoke in favour

[1] *Correspondence*, iii. 244. Richardson to Miss Westcomb, no date: '. . . styles differ, too, as much as faces, and are indicative, generally beyond the power of disguise, of the mind of the writer'.

[2] The removal, however, of the 'characteristic' features of Dolly's letter (ii. 327–8) is probably due to a desire for greater 'politeness' (in non-menials) which produced a general tidying of abbreviations and colloquialisms, even in some 'characteristic' letters like Uncle Anthony's, where it is to be regretted.

[3] Cf. 1st edn. iv. 64 with Shks. Head iv. 113; also 1st edn. iv. 20–24 with Shks. Head iv. 63–67.

[4] Lovelace: 1st edn. iii. 281 with Shks. Head iii. 307; Delicacy: 1st edn. iii. 153 with Shks. Head iii. 140. Cf. also the new index under this letter and the next.

of a HISTORY of LIFE and MANNERS; and which, as such, is designed for more than a transitory Amusement.

As a counter to that lack of attention of which we have found Richardson continually complaining, the moral import of letters, and their bearings on the problems which had been misunderstood, are clearly indicated in italics.

III. *The third edition*

The pattern of changes that appears so clearly in the second edition is continued consistently in the third.[1] A host of insertions, many of them minute, continue the process of opening out Lovelace's wickedness. The most effective are another 'vision' (iv. 115) in which he imagines his 'charmer' forced to speak out, and an allegorical debate (v. 254 ff.) between his Love and his Conscience. Both are again designed to drive home his heartlessness in dramatic terms. Richardson also, as he admits in his post-script defence, attempts to weight the contrast between Lovelace and Hickman more in Hickman's favour.[2] Another series of changes involves the problem of Clarissa's delicacy. The most striking of these (iii. 144 ff.) replaces a page of report by thirteen of dramatic argument, bringing to life another of Lovelace's false offers of marriage and conveying more strongly Clarissa's high notion of his duty and her unawareness of her danger. A fleeting memory that he had behaved rather similarly with her sister is a more effective reminder to the reader than any of Richardson's notes. In an epistolary novel this necessarily brings another addition in its wake as Lovelace describes the scene (iii. 177 ff.), confessing that he had raised the storm on purpose, and revealing the narrowness of her escape from his 'sudden gust of passion'. Richardson can no longer wait for his readers to discover for themselves that Clarissa was ill when she allowed her best opportunity to escape, and inserts another unacknowledged note (iii. 293). Lovelace is now (iii. 345 ff.) made to confess his involuntary sincerity in the scene in which Clarissa's nerve failed, which makes his failure to press her at this crucial point more culpable.

Such changes follow previous patterns. But a significant number of the changes in the third edition show a new desire to underline moral lessons and increase the novel's didactic value by explicit instruction and example. Most obviously, Clarissa is given some gloomy reflections on the disgrace

[1] For reasons of space I have confined my discussion to the most significant patterns of change and the most obvious examples of them. Some smaller changes are no less clearly related to the criticisms of Richardson's friends, especially Aaron Hill and Hester Mulso, but are less significant for the interpretation of the novel. It has not been possible to discuss the changes that probably are restorations.

[2] ii, letters 21, 22, and a comparison expanded, iii. 298. Cf. also the debate with Lady Bradshaigh, *Correspondence*, iv. 42 ff., 25 Nov. 1750. Also pp. 62 ff., 90 ff.

of her elopement even when her prospects are reasonably happy (iii. 336), and is made later to conclude that her physical attraction to Lovelace had been responsible for the 'officious' entry into correspondence with him from which her tragedy began (iv. 59–60). This is distinctly heavy-handed, and the latter part untrue. Seven 'moral histories' go to swell the novel's bulk (vi. 369, 392; viii. 284 ff.) and there can be little doubt that the modern reader would gladly forgo them.[1] The rewards and punishments of a moral novel are better served by giving the Harlowes more knowledge of their daughter's excellence, and deepening their remorse (viii. 278 ff.).[2] Perhaps the best of these changes is Belford's vivid picture of the death of a rake (vi. 354–5), which in its small way shows the influence of a tradition reaching back to the medieval preachers. But if moral concern may impart vigour and trenchancy, it may also have more unfortunate effects. In the first edition Anna's letter to Belford about Clarissa's life and character presents an idealized but not an impossible picture. In the third edition Richardson attempts to underline the perfection of his heroine, and hence her value as an example, in every conceivable direction. Insertion follows insertion (viii. 217–45 *passim*), producing the ideas of Clarissa's creator on almost every topic that could possibly bear on the life of a young woman in the early eighteenth century. The effect on a modern reader is precisely the opposite of the one intended. Instead of a final exaltation, the novel descends with heavy emphasis into the smug and stuffy atmosphere of a maiden's compendium. The dangers inherent in Richardson's didactic conception of the novel could hardly be more devastatingly illustrated.

IV. *Prefaces and postscripts*

The first edition contained a preface by Richardson in the first instalment, and another by Warburton in the second. The storm over the tragic ending lay ahead and unforeseen. Richardson's preface is a defence of his epistolary method, arguing that to reduce *Clarissa* to its narrative would be to rob it of life and warmth; and of moral efficacy, since the 'Story . . . should be considered as little more than a *Vehicle* to the more necessary INSTRUCTION'. He sums up the moral in two propositions: to warn parents against the undue exertion of their authority, and children against preferring 'a Man of Pleasure to a Man of Probity'. Warburton's preface is mainly an historical survey of the novel, but also contains a paragraph arguing the psychological realism and subtlety of the epistolary method. Both prefaces, then, are mainly concerned with a defence of method and

[1] But the Hill daughters seem to have welcomed the histories of Sally and Polly. Cf. Forster, xv. 2, fol. 39, no date.

[2] Suggested by Dr. Conybeare, Dean of Christ Church and subsequently Bishop of Bristol. Cf. Forster, xv. 2, fol. 38, 12 Sept. 1749.

'kind'. This was natural enough, since their relevance is to the four volumes they accompany, and wise enough, since the length of *Clarissa* has been the first objection urged against the novel from that day to this. But long before the last three volumes appeared the news of the tragic ending leaked out, and a spate of appeals for mercy resulted. They came from men like Fielding, Thomson, Lyttleton, and Cibber. Lady Bradshaigh threatened:

> If you disappoint me, attend to my curse:—May the hatred of all the young, beautiful, and virtuous, for ever be your portion! may you meet with applause only from envious old maids, surly bachelors, and tyrannical parents! may you be doomed to the Company of such! and, after death, may their ugly souls haunt you! Now make Lovelace and Clarissa unhappy if you dare.[1]

Clergymen and young ladies wrote under classical or flowery pseudonyms, vowing not to buy the forthcoming volumes if Richardson adhered to his plan. Beneath all this there lay a serious threat to the novel's commercial success, and Richardson as a businessman knew this perfectly well. There can be no doubt that a *Clarissa* with a happy ending would have sold more copies. Nor were the appeals all crudely sentimental. Many of the objectors invoked the theory of 'poetic justice' which critics like Dennis had advanced, and theoretical considerations would have their due weight with a novelist pledged to moral instruction by example.

To his lasting credit, Richardson remained unmoved. The postscript to the first edition sets out his defence. After a paragraph and a half almost identical with the later version, he goes straight to the point of his views of poetical justice by arguing that the present age expects 'from the Poets and Dramatic Writers' that they propagate a dispensation other than God's. Quotations from Addison and Rapin follow. Now Richardson claims that his distribution of rewards and punishments does fulfil poetic justice, with the sole exception of Clarissa whom only Heaven could reward. Five concluding paragraphs defend the epistolary method.

For the second edition he decided to remove both Warburton's preface and his own in favour of the detailed index. He now began to consider a revised preface, and followed an old habit of writing to friends for suggestions. Prefaces by Skelton and Joseph Spence, probably rejected as too general, survive in the Forster Collection along with Richardson's own draft[2]—a rambling affair which attempts to deal with a wide assortment of topics, many of which were worked into the final preface, and some later dismissed as trivial. Most significant, however, are the signs of ill-suppressed irritation, and a gloomy view of the frivolity of the age—both of which were to reappear in the third edition.

The final preface begins very much as before, but a new point is made

[1] *Correspondence*, iv. 181. 'Mrs. Belford' to Richardson, 10 Oct. 1748.
[2] Forster, xv. 2, fols. 51 ff.

of the 'usefulness' of the female correspondence, and the exemplary force of Clarissa's perfection. This may be related to the insertions into Anna's biography of her, and the passages where she is made to moralize on her story; and shows again how Richardson's attitude had hardened. After a new paragraph on the 'Characteristic' letters, meant as a palliative, he turns to the moral, and adds two significant propositions to the two in the original version. *Clarissa* now aims 'To warn the *Inconsiderate* and *Thoughtless* [my italics] of the one Sex, against the base arts and designs of specious Contrivers of the other', and 'above all, To investigate the highest and most important Doctrines, not only of Morality, but of Christianity, by showing them thrown into action in the conduct of the *worthy* characters; while the *unworthy*, who set those Doctrines at defiance, are condignly, and, as may be said, consequentially punished'. The first of these may be seen to relate to the misreadings of Lovelace's character and Clarissa's delicacy, and its acid phrasing is similar to the tone of many of Richardson's admonitory notes. The second as obviously bears on the problem of poetic justice. The next paragraph merely restates an opinion which had appeared in the first version, but the difference in Richardson's tone is further evidence of his irritation:

> From what has been said, considerate readers will not enter upon the perusal of the Piece before them, as if it were designed *only* to divert and amuse. It will probably be thought tedious to all such as *dip* into it, expecting a *light Novel* or *transitory* Romance; and look upon Story in it (interesting as that is generally allowed to be) as its sole end, rather than as a vehicle to the Instruction.

The only other interesting point is the reassertion that the new edition merely restores material omitted for 'shortening-sake'. The desire to preserve the fiction of his editorship is probably still the main explanation, but one may also suspect that having repeatedly accused his critics of want of attention to what was before them, he might not be prepared to reveal the extent of his alterations.

The changes in the postscript are even more significant. Richardson moves from defence to attack on the question of poetic justice. Recognizing that the criticisms come from 'feeling', he compares his critics' attitude to tragedy to that of Lovelace and the prostitutes. The sentimentalists have no desire to abate any of Clarissa's sufferings but the last, because of 'the sport her distresses . . . give to the tender-hearted reader'; they only insist on a patched-up happy ending. The most resonant passage of the draft preface then follows. Richardson attacks 'sudden conversions' on grounds of both probability and morality. It is easy to see how real Clarissa was to her creator, and the demands for a marriage to a suddenly converted Lovelace obviously struck him as an insult to his heroine.

The gloom of the draft preface then enters the final version. Richardson

> has lived to see Scepticism and Infidelity openly avowed, and even endeavoured to be propagated from the *Press*: the great doctrines of the Gospel brought into question: Those of self-denial and mortification blotted out of the catalogue of Christian virtues. And a taste even to wantonness . . . industriously promoted among all ranks and degrees of people.

It is against the background of 'this general depravity' that Richardson attempts to 'investigate the great doctrines of Christianity under the fashionable guise of an amusement'. He has tried to make his heroine a true object of pity, who looks 'forward to a *future Hope*', and death for such a one is not so terrible. Even 'the very Balaams of the world should not forbear to wish that their latter end might be like that of the Heroine'. At this point the new version joins the old in the array of authorities and adds a few more.[1] The discussion of the novel's rewards and punishments again follows the first edition.

Now he turns to answer objections to Clarissa's 'coldness', the inconsistency of a rake who is also a believer, the 'tameness' of Hickman, and the perfection of Clarissa. He will no longer admit that Clarissa felt anything more than 'liking' for Lovelace, and is stung to some outlandish remarks on love as '*Cupidity*, or a *Paphian Stimulus*'. (Readers unaware of the context will hardly react sympathetically.) He bases his defence of Lovelace on doctrinal utility, though he does just glance at his truth to experience, and the problem of Clarissa's involvement if Lovelace were an infidel. His attitude over Hickman is again didactic; the position of a moralist attempting to enforce a general doctrine by an extreme illustration. On the problem of his heroine's perfection he resorts again to the moral usefulness of the character, arguing that it is only improbable if we 'look for *Clarissa's* among the *constant frequenters* of Ranelagh and Vaux-hall' or the 'Daughters of the Card-table'.

The changes in preface and postscript may therefore be regarded once more as direct results of contemporary criticisms. They show evidence of Richardson's irritation, and far from resulting in concessions, they drive him to take up a more intransigent and didactic attitude towards his novel.

V

We may now attempt to summarize the conclusions to which this study has led. The new material is closely related to the criticisms of Richardson's readers, and most of the changes were designed to counteract misinterpretation and reinforce moral values. They show both Richardson's sensitivity and his stubbornness. He made no concessions to the taste of readers he

[1] Including, ironically, the 'Monody' of Lyttleton, who had been one of the objectors.

considered careless and superficial; indeed his attitude hardened, and he became less subtle and sympathetic and more starkly moralistic. But he was not stubborn enough to ignore his critics. He was driven to tinker with *Clarissa* to drive its message home in terms the crudest reader could understand.

He began in the second edition by providing an apparatus of notes which betray a new distrust of his audience. Somewhat acidly, he drew attention to those features of Lovelace's character and Clarissa's delicacy which they had carelessly failed to grasp. Many notes now anticipated future discoveries. He italicized moral sentiments and statements in the text which had a bearing on the main misreadings, thus breaking out of the subtle indirection of the epistolary form and communicating directly with his readers. He duplicated these in a laborious index designed to emphasize the pattern of the novel and serve as a constant admonition to superficial minds. He also began to make textual insertions. Many were designed to drive home the implications of Lovelace's intriguing head and callous heart; others were concerned with Clarissa's delicacy. Richardson was, it is true, opening out existing features, not introducing new ones. But the effect of the whole recension is of a lead pencil at work on a chiaroscuro; hardening outlines and converting the blend of light and shadow into a cruder black and white. In the changes which affect the 'characteristic' styles, he was again driven to make unnecessarily obvious what was already perfectly clear.

But the notes on Clarissa's delicacy show a much more damaging attitude. Readers had dared to blame Clarissa for her part in the tragedy. Richardson's reaction was to deny his own work. He would no longer admit her involuntary weakness, which contributes a fine tragic irony; he insisted heavily on her 'exemplary' perfection, and, by concentrating on the prudential nature of her behaviour, he obscured the more sympathetic values on which it is based, and presented a cruder analysis than the novel originally contained.

The third edition carried the process still farther. In the new 'morals' of the preface (upbraiding the critics by implication) and the many textual insertions on previous patterns, one detects again Richardson's irritation with and distrust of his readers. But two features are new. There is a very marked increase in explicit moralizing. This is visible in preface and postscript, and in the early volumes Clarissa is made to indulge in ponderous reflections on her story. In the later volumes, though there are still insertions on previous patterns, this trend has become the main one. *Sententiae* and moral history, rewards and punishments, make up a sizeable proportion of the new material. Richardson was never conspicuous for literary tact, but all sense of it deserts him now. The deplorable additions

to Anna's account of the heroine not only show him at his worst, but nearly ruin the final impression the novel had originally made. The other new feature, seen particularly in the postscript, is a deepening of irritation into gloomy anger. Richardson openly attacks his critics and the frivolity of an age in which a religious novel could be thus mangled in the reading. But anger is not the best mood in which to reply to criticism, and where he does deal with particular objections his attitude is extreme, his didacticism painfully obvious.

The third edition of *Clarissa* is, then, a novel perceptibly different from, and in many ways cruder than, the first. May Richardson's recension be one cause of the lack of sympathy which many modern readers feel? This is a problem for the editor as well as the critic. All modern editors, regarding the new material as straightforward restoration, have naturally printed the revised version as the author's final intention. But if the changes are proved to be, with relatively few exceptions, the direct result of the misinterpretations of an uncritical audience, the definition of 'intention' becomes less simple. Which represents Richardson's real intention: the novel he wrote expecting an audience capable of appreciating it, or the revision for one he found careless, superficial, and sentimental?

There would seem to be a strong case for printing the first edition. In it 'the master of the human heart' employed a greater subtlety of moral analysis and a more complex characterization; yet the values which moved him are perfectly clear. The revision simplifies, and in doing so distorts. Some important values tend to become obscured, while others become less palatable as modifying features are swept away to secure a harder and more 'exemplary' outline.

Yet there are losses entailed in merely substituting the first edition for the third. Some of the new material does improve upon the original. One of the finest of the changes, a new scene between Clarissa and her sister (i. 324 ff.), is a case in point. It certainly ought not to be a restoration, since it would have been an extremely unlikely cut;[1] nor is it a change designed to counter misreading. With its dramatic suspense and its acid verbal exchanges it looks most like a genuine improvement. Other less striking expansions of existing material also improve on their originals. Even within the patterns of recension it is possible to distinguish changes which do contribute new understanding, or grow organically out of the first edition by the use of the same dramatic imagination that was originally at work, from others which are merely imposed didactically. There are

[1] One remark in a letter to Aaron Hill might be taken as a hint that Richardson might have cut such a passage. 'I think the Altercations in the Family before she goes off, are a good deal too prolix. And yet I have had some Friends who like the Dialogue. . . .' (This is, however, the usual formula for polite disagreement.) Forster, XIII. 2, fol. 81, 5 Jan. 1746/7.

distinctions, for example, between the elucidation of Clarissa's motives where these are somewhat hidden, and her homilies and moralizings; between Belford's picture of the death of a rake and his sermon on Belton's love of the bastards; between the irritable insistence of the notes, and Clarissa's memory, in a new dramatic scene, of the way Lovelace had treated her sister. An editor primarily concerned to make Richardson available to new readers might feel that he would serve his author best by using critical judgement. It is the cumulative effect of all the changes (he might argue) that is so damaging; remove all the worst features and there is a new context for judging individual cases on their merits. Yet the difficulties and dangers of eclectic texts are sufficiently obvious.

It is not, however, the intention of this study to suggest any solution, but to show that the problem exists and must be faced. *Clarissa* is one of the few major novels of its century. It is important that criticism should include understanding of the changes wrought in it by the reactions of its earliest readers. And the standard edition should not, at least, remain unchallenged.

NOTES

AN UNPUBLISHED MIDDLE ENGLISH PROLOGUE

THE following poem was discovered on the dorse of Durham Dean and Chapter MS. Archid. Dunelm. 60. The date of this document, which is on parchment, is 1359; but the poem, which must be presumed to be the work of a monk, is in a fifteenth-century hand. The dialect is clearly northern, though OE. *ā* is spelt *o* throughout. Characteristic northernisms include *sikirly*, *mekill*, *swilk*, *sall*.

The piece is evidently the prologue to a play (ll. 5 and 34). For evidence of performances at Durham see E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), ii. 240–4.

It is possible, but not certain, that ll. 31–33 should be transposed to read

> O þis thing how it befell
> Me nedis 3ow no more to tell;
> Bot 3e sall her, and 3e will dwell
> How, &c.

Boured in l. 30 evidently means 'protected'. See *O.E.D.* under *Borrow* v.[1] 4, and S. d'Ardenne, *Seinte Iuliene* (Liége, 1936), p. 146 under *Burhe*.

Y is sometimes used for *þ*, as *yi* l. 22. These letters have been transcribed according to their function. Abbreviations have been expanded and punctuation and capitals modernized.

The writing at the head of the poem appears to be in the same hand as the rest, and the ink matches exactly. It seems to be a preliminary pen-trial.

[W W Wilon]

Pes, lordyngs, I prai 3ow pes,
And of 3our noys 3e stynt and ses;
Oure gamen to lett ner cry in pres
For 3our courtasy.
Þat we 3ow play it is no les
Godmen, sikirly.

Oure myrth we make of a knyght
Þat in his tyme was bold and wyght,
Rich of rent, man mekill of myght,
Proper and aupert.
Swilk hap gan fall þat on him light
Þat put him to pouert.

Þan he sight full wondre sore,
Þat so rich had ben before,
And had nothyng to leue on more;
His hert was full of grefe.
Þe fende apierd vntill him þor
As man at his myschiefe.

He saide, 'Man, lat be þi drede,
Þou leue an me and my lede
And þou sall haue all þat þe nede
Vntill þi lyues ende.'
Bot sikirly, als we cone rede,
Of Mary milde þan was his mende.

Mary had of him pite,
And till hir son scho knelid on kne,
Sayd, 'Son, 3on body gif me.
I chalange be right.'
Þus fro þe fendes pouste
Boured scho þe knyght.

Me nedis 3ow no more to tell.
Bot 3e sall her, and 3e will dwell,
O þis thing how it befell,
How þer it sall be plaied.
He kep 3ow all þat herid hell,
And sithen wp staied.

JUNE COOLING

SPENSER'S *PROTHALAMION*: A NEW GENRE

IN the last chapter of *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance*[1] Miss Veré Rubel says of Spenser's *Prothalamion*:

> Spenser seems to have written the *Prothalamion* with less care than he put into the *Epithalamion* despite his apology for haste in the final lines of his own marriage hymn.

She amplifies her point by saying that in the *Prothalamion* the rhetorical figures are *juxtaposed* rather than *interwoven*. But before we accept the suggestion that there is an unwholesome, artificial, additive quality in the diction and the larger rhetorical units of the poem, plot and allegory, it is perhaps desirable to consider what the real formal merits of the poem are.

It is a truism of literary history that the *Prothalamion* is not the same kind

[1] New York, 1941, pp. 264–6.

of 'marriage song' as the *Epithalamion*. That Spenser should have gone out of his way to coin an entirely new word, a genre-term, ought to warn us that there is more than a slight difference between the two poems. Spenser intended the term to replace 'Epithalamion' as a description of this poem, and he intended more than a mere exchange of prefixes. The sense of 'Epithalamion' is 'a song before the bridal chamber', or 'a song on the bridal day'. The full force of *pro-* is an emphatic 'before' which removes the occasion for song to a suitably remote time and place. Spenser's new genre is not that of the Epithalamion at all, but like the *gamelios* which could be sung at any festival connected with a wedding.[1] The occasion which Spenser chose to celebrate was the betrothal:[2] the progress of the brides by boat from Somerset House to Essex House. The actual marriage day and ceremony is excluded from the poem. Spenser must have considered the introduction of certain themes into his poem artistically indecorous and morally improper to the Epithalamion. On the other hand, the political theme, sustained most obviously in the *laudatio* on Essex in stanza ix, was admissible to the form of the Epithalamion. Indeed, the late Latin marriage song often combined Epithalamion and Panegyric. We need only glance at Claudian's *Epithalamion* (x) which celebrates the union of the Emperor Honorius to Maria, the daughter of Stilicho, to remark the obvious parallels. Lines 309–13 of *occupatio* in Claudian:

> Dicere possemus: quae proelia gesta sub Haemo,
> Quaeque cruentarint fumantem Strymona pugnae;
> Quam notus clipeo, quanta vi fulminet hostem,
> Ni prohiberet Hymen. Quae tempestiva relatu
> Nunc canimus.[3]

parallel Spenser's *correctio*, lines 141–3:

> But ah here fits not well
> Olde woes but ioyes to tell
> Against the bridale daye, which is not long. . . .

Claudian, lines 313–36, a panegyric on Stilicho, the father of the bride,

[1] Cf. Eustathius, *ad Iliadem*, 1541.49.

[2] Cf. J. M. Manly, *English Prose and Poetry* (Boston, 1926), p. 703. As the evidence of *The Faerie Queene*, I. x. 4, would suggest, the adj. *spousal* in *spousall verse* must be used in the sense of adj. *espousal*, 'betrothal'. *O.E.D.* records the first use of *espousal* in this sense for 1637 and comments that this sense developed late under the influence of the Latin *sponsus*. If we accept the description on the title-page as Spenser's, not editorial, then Spenser should be the first, or at least an earlier, user of the adj. *spousal* in the sense of 'betrothal'. Spenser elsewhere intends the adj. to mean 'marriage' (*F.Q.*, VII. vii. 12).

[3] 'Now could I tell of the battles fought beneath the slopes of Mount Haemus, the contests which caused the waves of Strymon to foam red with blood. I could sing the fame of his arms, and how, like a thunderbolt, he falls upon his foes, but Hymen forbids me. Our song must be appropriate to the season.'

correspond to Spenser, lines 145–62, a panegyric on Essex, the kinsman and protector of the two brides. Claudian ends his *laudatio* and makes the transition back to the marriage song in a direct, complimentary manner which ends on a note of loyalty (335–6):

> Plus iam, plus domino cuncti debere fatemur
> Quod gener est, invicte, tuus.[1]

Spenser's manner of ending the panegyric and making the transition back to marriage song is indirect. Spenser repeats what he did in a former transition in stanza vi, in which the miniature marriage ode of the river nymph is identified with the *Prothalamion* itself by identical refrains: 'So ended she . . .'. In stanza ix Spenser announces that some poet of a future age may sing a similar panegyric on Essex to a future audience. The grammatical completion of the sentence is managed by the refrain, 'Upon the bridale day . . .', which is a variation of the refrain used to end the miniature ode in stanza vi. 'Upon the bridale day' refers to future celebrations of Somerset marriages. The poet has skilfully linked this particular marriage to future marriages of the family and has answered the wish of the nymph in lines 104 ff. in her prayer for valorous issue to serve both family and nation.

All this is strictly proper to the Epithalamion. But in his *occupatio* Claudian said, 'I cannot treat epic themes in a marriage song.' Spenser, on the other hand, in his *correctio* says, 'It is improper for me to lament old sorrows.' It is this theme of criticism, deeply connected with the poet's own fortunes, as well as the nation's, which would make the Epithalamion the wrong form to attempt. Claudian risks little in contrasting the indecorousness of heroic and nuptial styles; but Spenser, by introducing political and moral criticism directly into a celebratory poem (ll. 5–10, 131–40, 145–58), risks destroying the whole coherence of mood and purpose (*laudare*) of the marriage song. 'Prothalamion', then, was invented to accommodate the new theme of criticism, both universal and personal. The satisfactory 'interweaving' (to use Miss Rubel's word) of the new themes with the traditional one of marriage illustrates above all Spenser's ability to imagine a whole poem, or larger parts of a poem, not merely fine passages. Claudian had Statius, *Silvae*, II. i, to fall back on. Spenser has had to manage a new kind of marriage song without any considerable model to which to appeal.

It would be hard to deny that the *Prothalamion* is unified by plot and allegory. The unity of plot is provided by the progression of the bridal party from Somerset House to Essex House. The allegorical unity lies in

[1] 'We all confess that now we owe our Emperor an even firmer allegiance for that thou, O invincible hero, art the father of this bride.'

the similitude of the brides to two swans swimming down the Thames attended by water-nymphs ('Daughters of the river Flood', l. 21) who are performing their summer *observaunce* on the banks.

The ground of the swan allegory is threefold. The first and most obvious element in the similitude is colour, *quality*, which is elaborately treated in lines 40–46. The second ground is *pragmatographia* or action: the brides and the swans are both floating on the river. The third ground is *paronomasia*. There is a concealed pun in *bryde* which turns on the metathetic form of *bird*(*e*): *brid*(*e*). The pun is aided by the confusion of *bird* with the separate northern word *byrd* (*burd*), 'a young maiden'. *O.E.D.* explains that it was generally understood that *bird* (a young maiden) was a figurative extension of *bird* (a young fowl). It quotes Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, IV. ii. 197, in this sense, but might well have quoted *The Taming of the Shrew*, V. ii. 42 ff., for the same sense, with the additional pun on *bride*. The Shakespeare passage is an exact parallel for Spenser's pun in the *Prothalamion*:

> *Vincentio*: Ay, mistress bride, hath that awaken'd you?
> *Bianca*: Ay, but not frighted me: Therefore I'll sleep again.
> *Petruchio*: Nay, that you shall not; since you have begun
> Have at you for a bitter jest or two.
> *Bianca*: Am I your bird? I mean to shift my bush. . . .

This *paronomasia*, whatever its linguistic origin, continually translates the allegory so that Spenser need not openly resolve the similitude at the end of the poem. Indirectly he encourages the identification by parallel phrases: in l. 39, *two fayrer Byrds*, in l. 175, *two fayre Brydes*.

If the poem is characterized by forceful quality of similitude, verbal boldness is another feature. Just as the play on *bryde* and *byrde* is an essential part of the allegory, so is the pun on Somerset, *Somers-heat*, in line 67.[1] The family name is etymologically connected with the season of maturity, the 'sweetest Season, when each Flower and weede / The earth did fresh aray . . .'. This pleasant fertility, noticed in the *chronographia* of the opening stanza, is made to contrast with the poet's melancholy (5–10); and this contrast is the central one of the poem: the contrast of decayed nobility with the rehabilitating effects of love and the approaching marriage. The sustained contrast is begun in stanza viii in the *descriptio* of the Inns of Court and the contrasting description of Essex House. The technique which Spenser uses here is similar to that of the long historical *digressio* on Ireland in the *Mutability Cantos*. In stanza viii the poet contrasts the 'bricky towers' with the 'stately palace' and 'high towers' of Essex House.

[1] Cf. ll. 153–4, with the possible pun on *Devereux*: *devenir heureux*.

The occasion for digression is provided by unity of place, just as Arlo Hill, the scene of the dispute of the gods, had been the *locus amoenus* of Diana, now fallen into change and degeneration. The Inns of Court, now inhabited by Templars ('studious lawyers'), once were the dwellings of 'Templar Knights'. The heroic has been diminished to the legal. Former chivalry has become debased by pride. Essex House, standing in what was the garden of the Outer Temple, is compared favourably with the Inns of Court. The mood of melancholy is extended as the poet remembers the death (in 1588) of the former inhabitant, Leicester. But this is the climax and the end of the themes of criticism. In lines 141–3 they are brought into the open and made to clash with the marriage theme. The conflict of degeneration and regeneration is resolved in the very first line of stanza ix: 'Yet therein now doth lodge a noble Peer . . .' and the *laudatio* on Essex, the 'Flower of Chivalry', follows.

The poem ends with the meeting of the brides and bridegrooms, presided over by their protector, Essex. The bridegrooms, compared to the stellified Castor and Pollux, are led almost to the river by Essex, who is compared to Hesperus. The *comparatio* is imitated from Virgil, *Aeneid*, VIII. 589 ff., in which Pallas is compared to the Morning Star rising (*extulit*):[1]

> From those high Towers, this noble Lord issuing,
> Like Radiant *Hesper* when his golden hayre
> In th' Ocean billows he hath Bathed fayre,
> Descended to the Riuers open vewing,
> With a great traine ensuing.

Spenser's use of Virgil's famous simile is at once complicated yet intended to give shape to the end of the allegory. In Virgil, Pallas, the type of noble young warrior, is compared to the Morning Star (*Lucifer*); Spenser's conceit turns on the fact that the Morning Star and the Evening Star are one.[2] In the simile Essex is described as the Morning Star (*Hesper* by *abusio* standing for *Lucifer*), but in the narrative action he *descends* to the river. That is, he is the Evening Star.[3] Essex is the Morning Star in virtue of his warrior nobility, and the Evening Star in respect of his role as protector of the brides, and the person who brings the bridegrooms to the brides.[4] Compare *Epithalamion*, 285 ff.:

[1] Qualis ubi Oceani perfusus Lucifer unda,
Quem Venus ante alios astrorum diligit ignis
Extulit os sacrum caelo tenebrasque resolvit.

[2] Cf. Donne, 'The Second Anniversary', 197–8.

[3] Cf. Servius's note to *Aeneid*, VIII. 589: 'Venus in caelo habet unam propriam stellam quae oriens Luciferum, occidens Vesperum facit.'

[4] Catullus, LXII. 1 ff.

> Long though it be, at last I see it gloome,
> And the bright euening star with golden creast
> Appeare out of the East.
> Fayre childe of beauty, glorious lampe of loue
> That all the host of heauen in rankes doost lead,
> And guydest louers through the nightes dread . . . .

This simile resolves the action of the poem and further unifies the themes of nobility and marriage. Essex is the symbol, as it were, which at once reclaims fallen chivalry and watches over a marriage which will maintain the new chivalry. There is a note of gentle politeness in having Essex descend to be the protector of the brides, just as there is a touch of hyperbole in raising the two gentlemen to knighthood in the allegory.

In the *Prothalamion* Spenser is economical, subtle, and inventive. Whatever faults the poem has, and lines 24–25 are of extraordinary feebleness, they are certainly not serious enough to merit for the poem a depreciatory contrast to the *Epithalamion*.

J. Norton Smith

'LOVE' IN *KING LEAR*

The first scene of *King Lear* has been described as improbable, Lear's question 'How much do you love me?' has been called imponderable and improper, and his equation 'so much love=so much land', is said to be immoral. Such epithets are without doubt justifiable, but their justification may well lie on firmer ground than 'suspension of disbelief', or the traditional facts of the plot. What is certainly present in this first scene is a deliberate probing of the nature of love; a contrasting of love as a spiritual quality with the opposing material elements involved in money, land, and the division of a kingdom. Although this examination is carried out immaculately in terms of character, with the spiritual quality of Cordelia's love poised against the material gains for which Goneril and Regan vie, it is possible to suggest a further, subtler probing of the problem through the words used by these characters, particularly the word *love* itself. The two different, almost opposite meanings which this word could have at the time when Shakespeare was writing hint at, in miniature, the movement of the whole play.

O.E.D. gives as a developed meaning of *Love*, v.[2] (OE. *lofian* 'praise') 'to appraise, estimate or state the price or value of'. This is an entirely different word in origin and phonetic history from *Love*, v.[1] (OE. *lufian*), and was not originally a homophone of it. Its normal development to [lɔ:v] is shown by the sixteenth-century spelling *loave*; but there are

fourteenth- and fifteenth-century spellings, *louve* and *lowf*, which indicate a raising of the vowel such as is found before *v* in several words.[1] The apparent development of *Love*, v.[2] into a homophone of *Love*, v.[1] by this process—whether or not followed by shortening—would make possible the punning use quoted by *O.E.D.* from the *Towneley Mysteries*, in which the meaning of 'to estimate the value of' is made to intrude on the more usual 'to feel affection for'. The pun as used in this particular situation has something of an archetypal nature, for it is Judas who is asked how much he *loves* Jesus Christ; in the punning sense his answer is inevitable:

PILATUS. Now, Iudas, sen he shalbe sold,
how *lowfes* thou hym? belyfe fet se.
IUDAS. ffor thretty pennys truly told
or els may not that bargan be. (xx. 238 ff.)

As late as 1530 this use of *love* is recognized in John Palsgrave's *Lesclaircissement de la Langue Francoyse*, in the English-to-French section of a 'Table of Verbes':

I love, as a chapman loveth his ware that he wyll sell. *Je fais.* Come of, howe moche love you it at: *sus, combien le faictiez vous?* I love you it nat so dere as it coste me: . . .I wolde be gladde to bye some ware of you, but you love all thynges to dere. . . .[2]

This sense does not appear in any dictionary after 1530, but seems to have been singled out for close attention here. It seems fair to say, then, that this other verb *to love*, with its clearly defined meaning, was well known at this time, and probably for some time afterwards.

In his book *Words and Sounds in English and French* (Oxford, 1953), Professor John Orr, in the chapter 'On Homonymics', writes of a homonymic 'collision' which took place between the Old French verbs *esmer* and *aimer*. In the evolution of the French language, says Orr, *esmer* 'to reckon, calculate', although later replaced by the modern *priser*, nevertheless tended, in the final stages before *priser* supplanted it, to invade the 'psychological field' of *aimer* 'to love'. To illustrate his point he quotes from the *Roman de Brut* by Wace (one of the sources of the *Lear* story and significantly very like Holinshed's version).[3] Cordelia, disgusted at her sister's flattery, answers, when asked by her father how much she loves him:

Mes peres iés, jo aim tant tei
Com jo mun pere amer dei.
E pur faire tei plus certein,
Tant as, tant vals e jo tant t'aim. (1739 ff.)

[1] See E. J. Dobson, *English Pronunciation 1500–1700* (Oxford, 1957), §151 and n. 2.
[2] Quoted from the Paris edition of 1852, p. 614.
[3] See W. Perrett, *The Story of King Lear* (Berlin, 1904).

The apparent translation of this last line is 'so much you have, so much you are worth, and so much I love you'. But Orr goes on to show that this line is a recognized proverbial saying, in the manner of a pun, where the equivocation is between *aimer* 'to love' and the similarly pronounced *esmer* 'to estimate the value of'. So the punning translation of this line is now 'So much you have, so much you are worth, *of such a price* (*or value*) *you are to me*'.

Thus, the fact that there was a homonymic intrusion of *esmer* into the psychological field of *aimer* is established. It persists in the use of *aimer cher* in the Old and Middle French period, cognate with English 'to love dearly'. Palsgrave and the other evidence of *O.E.D.* shows that a similar intrusion, of the sense of *lofian* into the field of *lufian*, was possible in English at this time.[1]

It is generally accepted that Holinshed's *Chronicles* were among Shakespeare's sources for *King Lear*. Holinshed's version of Cordelia's reply to Lear in the 'division' scene is almost exactly taken from Wace:

> . . .I protest vnto you that I haue loued you euer, and will continuallie (while I liue) loue you as my naturall father. And if you would more vnderstand of the loue that I beare you, assertaine your selfe, that *so much as you haue, so much you are worth, and so much I loue you and no more.*[2]

Whether the pun is intentionally implicit in this version of the line mentioned above is not apparent; but linguistically it is implicit in the two senses of *love* whether Holinshed meant it to be there or not.

Shakespeare's grasping of the pun upon *love*, whether or not from Holinshed, can be detected without doubt in *King Lear*. Not surprisingly, Goneril's *love* presents a fairly precise, tabulated catalogue in the manner of an 'estimate':

> Sir, I love you more than words can wield the matter,
> Dearer than eye-sight, space, and liberty;
> Beyond what can be valued rich or rare;
> No less than life, with grace, health, beauty, honour;
> As much as child e'er loved or father found;

[1] The existence of a punning connexion of the two meanings of *love* for a length of time in literature is not a thing that can be proved, but it would be ridiculous to suppose that immediately after the publication of *Lesclaircissement* the verb *Love*[2] fell out of use. Often examples of the equivocation crop up unexpectedly, such as in Marvell's *To His Coy Mistress*:

> An hundred years should go to praise
> Thine eyes, and on thy forehead gaze
> . . . . . .
> For lady you deserve this state,
> *Nor would I love at lower rate.*

The connexion of *love* and *rate* fairly invites the equivocal interpretation of *love* as 'value'.

[2] Everyman edn. (London, 1927), p. 226.

A love that makes breath poor and speech unable;
Beyond all manner of so much I love you. (I. i. 56 ff.)

It is left to Regan to colour this estimate to one in terms of money, which she does with an image of coinage:

Sir, I am made
Of the self-same metal that my sister is,
And prize me at her worth. . . . (I. i. 70 ff.)

Cordelia's remark at a very early stage in the proceedings has indicated her direct rejection of the whole immoral nature of *love* as an expressible 'value'. She seizes on the fact that the true sense of *love* implies something which it is impossible to conceive of and 'estimate or state the value of' in any terms. Discarding the punning use of the other verb *to love* which her sisters have offered to Lear she says 'What shall Cordelia do? Love, and be silent' (I. i. 63). Her reply to the King comes with all the force of Wace's play:

. . . I love your majesty
According to my bond; nor more nor less. (I. i. 93)

TERRY HAWKES

A SOURCE FOR *THE REVENGER'S TRAGEDY*

The Revenger's Tragedy is one of the few important plays of the Elizabethan period for which no major source has ever been discovered. Suggestions that contemporary history might have supplied motifs have been made from time to time, but the correspondences cited have all been vague and general, and have not established any necessary connexion. One section of the play, however, has a clear source, and from an examination of this it seems possible to derive a general hypothesis (which has already been argued on other grounds) that the play is made out of a patchwork of incidents, rather than derived from a single source.

Act II, scene ii, of the play works out an elaborately twisted design (characteristic of Tourneur), spying being set against counter-spying, lust against counter-lust, revenge against counter-revenge. Vindice hears of Spurio's fornication with the Duchess; Spurio hears of Lussurioso's intended fornication with Castiza. When Spurio goes out to catch Lussurioso in the act, Lussurioso enters and demands Castiza. To divert his interest Vindice tells him of Spurio and the Duchess, and Lussurioso goes out to catch them. Now, to complete the circle, comes the episode which is borrowed (from Heliodorus)—a borrowing which surely must have prompted the fabrication of the intrigue which leads up to it. Lussurioso breaks into the royal bed-chamber with his sword drawn, hoping

to take Spurio and the Duchess together, but in fact he finds that it is his father who is in the bed; too amazed to offer resistance, he is arrested and thrown into prison.

This clearly comes from an episode in Cnemon's narrative in the first book of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. In this the story is closer to the legend of Hippolitus; the stepmother loves the son, and being repulsed determines on revenge. She bribes a servant to misinform him, as Vindice misinforms Lussurioso.

> About three nights after, she came, and waked me out of my sleepe, and tolde me that an adulterer was come in, and that my father upon occasion suddenly was gone into the countrey, and he according to appointment, was gone to bedde to Demeneta, therefore it was expedient for me to haste to bee revenged, and put on my sworde, that the knave might not escape. I did so, and taking my sworde in my hande, followed those which carried a candle before, and went to the bedde chaumber. When I came neare the doore, and perceived the glimmering of a candle through the slivers and the doores lockt: Verie angrie as I was, brake up the doores, and ranne in crying out, where is that same villaine, the worthie lover of this chaste Dame? Which when I had said, I came to the bedde in minde to slea them both, but therewith my Father (O God) leapt out of the bedde, and falling on his knees, before me, saide, My sonne, have pitie uppon thy Father, spare his white haires, that hath brought thee up . . . But I, as I had ben stricken with a thunderboult, stood still amased, and looked round aboute after Thisbe, who had I knowe not howe conveied her selfe away, neyther had one worde to say, neither coulde I tell, what was best to do, and in this case my sword fell out of my hands, which Demeneta straight way caught up, and my father then out of daunger, laide handes upon me, and commanded me to be bound. (*An Æthiopian History*. Englished by Thomas Underdowne anno 1587 (London, 1895), pp. 20 f.)

Certain verbal similarities between the wording of Underdowne's translation and the words used in the play may be taken to indicate direct contact. 'Where is that same villaine' says Cnemon, and 'Where is that villain' echoes Lussurioso; Cnemon 'stood still amased' and Lussurioso is 'amazed to death'.

The possibility always exists, of course, that Tourneur used another imitation of the *Aethiopica* incident. There are such in Sidney's 'Old' *Arcadia* (ed. Feuillerat, iv. 149) and (considerably changed) in the 'New' *Arcadia* (i. 248 f.) but neither of these can be thought to intervene between Underdowne and *The Revenger's Tragedy*.

G. K. HUNTER

A HOUSMAN 'REMINISCENCE'

MR. NORMAN MARLOW, in his recently published *A. E. Housman, Scholar and Poet* (London, 1958), sets out a very large number of Housman's 'reminiscences', conscious and unconscious, of the work of other writers. Many, if not most, of these had been already included in two lists of such reminiscences, one compiled by Professor G. B. A. Fletcher and printed in an Appendix to Grant Richards's *Housman 1859–1936* (Oxford, 1941), the other contained in an article, 'Echoes in the Poetry of A. E. Housman', which I contributed to *The Nineteenth Century* (CXV, 243–56) in 1934. (No reference is made to my article either by Professor Fletcher or by Mr. Marlow.)

My article, being published in Housman's lifetime, contained no reminiscences from his posthumously published poems. Perhaps I may here draw attention to one such reminiscence which is not mentioned by Professor Fletcher or by Mr. Marlow. It provides, I think, an interesting example of the process by which (to repeat words which I have used elsewhere—see the Preface to the Penguin edition of Housman's *Collected Poems*, 1956) 'verbal tunes and patterns played a leading part in Housman's hidden process of "secretion",' and it may be thought to confirm my suggestion that 'what brought most of his poems into embryonic being was simply the imposition of a pattern upon a mood'.

The poem to which I would call attention is 'The Land of Biscay' (*More Poems*, No. XLVI); to make my point, I think it is necessary to quote it in full:

Hearken landsmen, hearken seamen,
  to the tale of grief and me,
Looking from the land of Biscay
  on the waters of the sea.

Looking from the land of Biscay
  over Ocean to the sky
On the far-beholding foreland
  paced at even grief and I.
There, as warm the west was burning
  and the east uncoloured cold,
Down the waterway of sunset
  drove to shore a ship of gold.
Gold of mast and gold of cordage,
  gold of sail to sight was she,
And she glassed her ensign golden
  in the waters of the sea.

Oh, said I, my friend and lover,
take we now that ship and sail
Outward in the ebb of hues and
steer upon the sunset trail;
Leave the night to fall behind us
and the clouding counties leave:
Help for you and me is yonder,
in a haven west of eve.

Under hill she neared the harbour,
till the gazer could behold
On the golden deck the steersman
standing at the helm of gold,
Man and ship and sky and water
burning in a single flame;
And the mariner of Ocean
he was calling as he came:
From the highway of the sunset
he was shouting on the sea,
'Landsman of the land of Biscay,
have you help for grief and me?'

When I heard I did not answer,
I stood mute and shook my head:
Son of earth and son of Ocean,
much we thought and nothing said.
Grief and I abode the nightfall,
to the sunset grief and he
Turned them from the land of Biscay
on the waters of the sea.

There is an atmosphere of fanciful romance about this poem that cannot be matched exactly in anything else that Housman wrote. Its lilting measure, also, though it resembles one of Housman's favourite metres, was not exactly reproduced by him elsewhere. I would suggest that both mood and metre are echoed from the following poem by the American poet Richard Hovey:

The Sea Gipsy

I am fevered with the sunset,
I am fretful with the bay,
For the wander-thirst is on me
And my soul is in Cathay.

There's a schooner in the offing,
With her topsails shot with fire,
And my heart has gone aboard her
For the Islands of Desire.

I must forth again tomorrow!
With the sunset I must be
Hull down on the trail of rapture
In the wonder of the sea.

Apart from the similarity of mood and the identity of metrical pattern, there are important common features: the sunset, the Bay, the ship with flame-gold sails, and the ocean 'trail'; while the concluding lines provide an almost identical echo. Can one doubt that Housman had seen Hovey's poem and recollected it, consciously or unconsciously, when he wrote his own?

Any such doubt is removed, I think, by the following considerations. There is no evidence of the date when Housman composed his poem; Hovey's was printed in *Poets of the Younger Generation*, a stout volume of some 570 pages edited by William Archer and published by John Lane in 1902. This book contains thirty-three critical essays by Archer on English and American poets of the day, each illustrated by a woodcut portrait by Robert Bryden, and accompanied by a selection of the verse of the author discussed. Pp. 183–95 are occupied by an essay, with copious quotations, on A. E. Housman; pp. 196–205 are similarly devoted to Laurence Housman; pp. 206–17 to Richard Hovey. In quoting 'The Sea Gipsy' on p. 207, Archer observes that the poem 'is included by Mr. E. V. Lucas in his delightful anthology *The Open Road*'; 'but I cannot leave to Mr. Lucas', says Archer, 'the credit of having been its "discoverer" on this side of the Atlantic; I had quoted it at least a year earlier in the *Pall Mall Magazine*.' The first edition of *The Open Road* appeared in 1899. In his Prefatory Note to *Poets of the Younger Generation* Archer writes as follows:

> This book was ready for the press in the autumn of 1899, when the outbreak of the war in South Africa led to the postponement of publication. . . . The title I originally had in mind was *Living Poets of the Younger Generation*; but while the book lay in manuscript, the death of that very able writer, Mr. Richard Hovey, made a melancholy gap in my 'living' poets. Death having, so to speak, called him out of the rank, I have made Mr. Hovey's portrait the frontispiece of this volume.

In his Bibliographical Appendix Archer records two volumes only of poems by Hovey: *Launcelot and Guinevere* (New York, 1891) and *Along the Trail: a Book of Lyrics* (Boston, 1898).

I submit that Housman must have read 'The Sea Gipsy' among Hovey's poems, or (more probably) in *The Pall Mall Magazine* or *The Open Road*, or (more probably still) in *Poems of the Younger Generation* (where it was separated by only a few pages from a discussion of his own and his brother's poetry), and that he recollected it, perhaps without knowing that he did so, when he came to write 'The Land of Biscay'. JOHN SPARROW

REVIEWS

Syntax und Semantik der modalen Hilfsverben im Altenglischen. By EWALD STANDOP. Pp. 178 (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 38). Bochum-Langendreer: Pöppinghaus, 1957. DM. 20.00.

This work is a very useful addition to the literature of Old English syntax. Vast as that literature is, if one had to select from it half a dozen treatises for a pupil to read in the absence of a general work on the subject, Dr. Standop's book might well be among them. The book gives the impression that its author is an acute Old English scholar, highly sensitive to shades of meaning, and that the subject chosen was extremely well suited to his talents.

Standop deals mainly with four verbs, *magan*, *motan*, *sculan*, and *willan*.[1] The various meanings of each are discussed and exemplified, and then their functions in the chief types of subordinate clause are described. In dealing with *magan*, Standop makes an unchallengeable distinction of the senses 'be able', 'may' (with various nuances), and 'be permitted'. He is less convincing when he attempts (pp. 24–27) to find in OE. an optative 'may', which would be the ultimate ancestor of the undoubted optative 'may' of ModE. (e.g. 'may God bless you'). The OE. material which Standop adduces all belongs to either 'may well' (pp. 20–21) or 'be permitted' (pp. 27–29). E. V. Gordon's downright 'the use of *mæg* in an optative sense is unknown in OE.' (note on *Maldon* 315) remains unshaken by all Standop can say to the contrary (cf. p. 40 and footnote).

In his chapters on *motan*, Standop deals well with the nuances of the sense 'may' and with the growth of the sense 'must'. Neither here nor in his treatment of *sculan* and *willan* is his classification of senses to be seriously challenged, though the examples given are not always appropriate.[2] While in dealing with *magan* and *motan* Standop was able to break new ground, his work on *sculan* and *willan* inevitably invites comparison with Carl Lüttgens's study.[3] There is a good deal of overlap, but while Standop offers less material, his classification of senses is more practical and controllable. Noteworthy sections are the demonstration of the frequence of *sculan* in defining what is customary (pp. 100–1),[4] and the discussion of *þæt . . . wolde* clauses as equivalents of paratactic *wolde . . .* (pp. 141–3). To the examples of the latter construction *Dream of the Rood* 34 should probably be added.

Standop fully discusses the possibility of an OE. use of *sculan* and *willan* with the infinitive to form a periphrastic future. He admits this as a rarity, found with *sculan* in the first person and with *willan* in the second and third. The case is,

[1] The rivalry of *magan* and *cunnan* is briefly considered, p. 66.

[2] E.g. of the examples given on p. 139 of the pret. of *willan* 'be in the habit of', those from Boeth. and Oros. 112, 19 are sound, but Oros. 206, 34 and 132, 32 have *wolde* 'desired'.

[3] *Über Bedeutung und Gebrauch der Hilfsverba im frühen Altenglischen*: sculan *und* willan. Kiel diss., 1888.

[4] E.g. *heora ðeaw wæs, ðæt heo . . . sceoldon.*

of course, more difficult to prove with *sculan*, for it is practically impossible to demonstrate the absence of all feeling for one or other compelling force in a statement beginning *ic sceal* or *we sculon*. For purely futural *willan* there are one or two good examples, especially *ic mæg ðe secgan git sum ðing . . . ðæt ðu wilt gelyfan* and *ðonne ðyncð him ðæt hie wiellen acuelan*, and in the future in the past, *ða Darius geseah ðæt he oferwunnen beon wolde*. It is doubtful, however, if the temporal sense predominates in all the passages with *willan* quoted pp. 163–4. Many are rather instances of *willan* 'be in the habit of', which is very common in describing customary or repeated actions, or actions due to the nature of a person or thing.

A few points concerning the modal verbs generally may be mentioned. Standop (p. 40) is somewhat vague on the question whether an indicative modal verb with an infinitive is ever a subjunctive equivalent, and in his discussion of *And.* 860–1, where *miht ongitan* is equivalent to *ongite* (final clause), he quotes no parallel, but cf. *And.* 546 where *areccan mæg* is parallel to *wite*.

Standop is little concerned with the comparative approach to syntactic problems. He makes a bare remark on the wide development in West Germanic of a sense 'must' for *motan* (p. 75), though the manner in which he expresses himself makes it uncertain whether he is aware that this phenomenon is to be observed in Dutch and Frisian as well as English and German. He does not mention that *sculan* (*zullen*, *scille*) is even more widely used in Dutch and Frisian to form the periphrastic future than in English. An old problem of comparative Germanic syntax upon which Standop does not touch is the formation of perfect and pluperfect tenses from modal verbs lacking a past participle,[1] though the question has not, I think, been discussed with regard to OE. Instances are not numerous, but equivalents to such tenses can be formed by use of the adverb *furðum*, e.g. *ðonne hi furðum gan magon* 'when they have become able to walk', *siððan he . . . furðum meahte his waldendes willan fremman* 'after he had been able to perform his ruler's wish'.

It would have been methodically better in a work concerned with refinements of syntax to have excluded quotations from *Gen. B*, and to have discussed separately any peculiarities of that poem, for it often differs slightly from OE. usage owing to its Old Saxon origin. Nevertheless, Standop shows his sound OE. scholarship in corrections of R. K. Gordon's version of *Gen. B* on p. 99. He slips, however, on p. 48: *gif ic ænegum ðægne ðeodenmadmas geara forgeafe* is not 'if I ever gave', but unreal 'if I had given of old', and since this is not good sense, the clause is better regarded as an indirect question,[2] depending on what precedes: 'let us think of the army, think whether I gave princely treasures of old to any warrior'.

A. CAMPBELL

Middle English Dictionary. Edited by HANS KURATH; Associate Editor, SHERMAN M. KUHN. Parts A 1–4, B 1–2, E 2–3, F 1–4. Plan and Bibliography.

[1] This problem and many others are discussed in a work unfortunately omitted from Standop's bibliography, E. R. Magnusson, *Syntax des Prädikatsverbums im Mittelniederdeutschen* (Lund, 1939).

[2] For *gif* introducing indirect questions see *B.-T. Supp.*, under *gif*, vi.

Pp. iv+1–764; 121–952. Plan and Bibliography, pp. xii+106. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1953–7. 21*s.* net each part.

In welcoming the first part of this Dictionary the present reviewer described it as 'something very spacious and on a grand scale' (*R.E.S.*, N.S. v (1954), 277–8); there is no reason to change that description, for the air of spaciousness has continued through the parts since published, which have completed E, F, and A, and done part of B.

The Plan and Bibliography, published in 1954, indicate that the entry forms are based on the S.-E. Midland dialect; the Bibliography (a very full one) clearly comes up to 1953; and the only point noted in it is that (under *Agnus Castus*) the editor's name is Brodin, not Brödin.

While undoubtedly this will be an indispensable tool for all scholars in the Middle English field for many years, nevertheless a test from a few published works has shown even these editors to be fallible. For example, Sandahl's *Middle English Sea Terms*, i (1951) has clearly been used, but apparently spasmodically, since *M.E.D.* does not record Sandahl's *aile*, *alcash*', *allangose*, and *alouor*, and if one could argue for their omission, as perhaps not English words, that argument must surely fail for *anned* (nail) (1358–9), *beak* (of a ship) (1400–2), *bend* (part of a rudder) (1294–5), and *false beam* (1399–1400), which is not given under *fals*. Similarly, earlier examples than those found in *M.E.D.* are given by Sandahl for *bemnail* (1337–9), *English bord* (1378), *estrich bord* (1307–8), *flornail* in its nautical sense (1337–9), and *for(e)castel* (1335–6).

Similarly, a check with the most recent edition of *Macer Floridus* has produced *abate* (vb., to bring down in size), *adustin*, *-ion*, *afterburthen* (afterbirth), *alysse*, *fotsole*, and *froth of silver*, while earlier examples are given than are in *M.E.D.* of *aloe* and *alethen*. Then Gösta Brodin's edition of *Agnus Castus* gives us *foulys tayl*, *frenchwourts*, *frenschpes*, and *freynsch cresse*.

Quite a number of personal names are to be found in these parts of *M.E.D.*, and Thuresson's *Middle English Occupational Terms* is frequently quoted. Omitted, however, are Thuresson's *Akerreue* (1333), *Aylle*r (1304), *Bacheler* (1166), *Barremaker* (1347), *Basmaker* (1494), *Benere* (1259), *Berebrewer* (1423), *Berngreive* (1327), *Erminer* (1263), *Eschippre* (1181) (which should at least have a cross-reference), *Esperoner* (1291), *Esquier* (1207), *Faulder* (1332), *Fermer* (1238), *Filer* (1305), *Floter* (1249), *Fodier* (1327), *Foldman* (1255), *Folwer* (1279), *Forcermaker* (1406), *Forester* (1188), *Forker* (1376), *Forridere* (1318), *Frithere* (1327), and *Fretheman* (1352), *Frutrer* (1332). An earlier example of *Ampuller* (1242) is given by Thuresson. Though *M.E.D.* gives *bēdel-wīke*, the office or jurisdiction of a beadle, it does not give the simple *bēdel* (in Thuresson from 1219), unless there is an error in cross-referencing. Even so, it is curious if compounds figure under *be-* and the simplex under *bi-*.

It is tempting to browse in the pages of *M.E.D.*, noting such points as the obsolescence of words, the differences in vocabulary of contemporaries like Chaucer and Gower, and so on. Clearly there must be a host of studies and collections following *M.E.D.*, and one of the most important will surely be the

study of Middle English proverbs and sayings (not all so designated in *M.E.D.*). Finally, there is some divergence in the amount of space given to meanings; sometimes they are very full, as with legal terms, sometimes too brief—e.g. *Aylesham*.

And finally some minor points noted in scanning various parts.

a conj. [Weak form of *and*.] But surely, in second meaning, (if)=*an*? *ā* interj. an exclamation used . . . to express attitudes and emotions, &c. (i.e.=ah!). But the quotation from *Now ys Crystemas* has *styll-a*, with which cf. the use in Shakespeare, e.g. 'My dainty duck, my dear-a' on which Dr. Onions (*Shakespeare Glossary*) states the *-a* is 'used, without affecting the meaning, to provide an extra syllable in burlesque verse'. The meaning assigned to *abbater* fits the example somewhat uneasily. Under *abstinence*, a quotation is given from *The Romaunt of the Rose*, but none for *abstinence-streyned* in the same work. Under *acces(se*, n. 1 (b), four lines of text have been repeated. The treatment of Chaucer's 'For gold in phisik is a cordial', under *accordial*, 'appropriate; hence, effective', hardly seems to strengthen the meaning; and it is the only instance of this meaning quoted. To gloss *acombraunce* n. (b) by 'harassment, ?subjection' is surely not good lexicographical practice. Similarly, the interpretation of *acursed* as 'obstinate' seems to be based on fairly flimsy evidence. On *adanttrocay* a mere reference to Skeat's edition of the work quoted seems inadequate. Under *adrinken*, v. for OE. *adrinkan* read *ādrincan*. Under malice *aforethought*, could there be a cross-reference to malice *prepense*, the earlier form? Under *age*, n. 1 b., the example of *perfit age* is not very satisfactory, nor is 'maturity' a good gloss, since the definition of 'perfect age' may have varied considerably; in Scotland at any rate it seems to have varied from fourteen to twenty-five years. Incidentally *O.E.D.* quotes from the Wycliffite translation of the Bible (under *Perfect*). The first part of the article *Agrippa* (p. 159) is omitted. Since the majority of the *alien priories* were suppressed by Act of Parliament in 1414, one would expect quotations earlier than 1437. *Alies* glossed as 'service-berries' is confusing, if not meaningless, to English readers (see *O.E.D.* under *Service-tree*). Under *anēlen*, it should be noted that for the solitary passage quoted (*Gawain* 723), O. F. Emerson suggested the meaning 'raged at'. *astēl*, *astelle*: only OF. and ML. words are given for the derivation; surely there should be a reference to the famous *æstel* of the Preface to Alfred's *Cura Pastoralis*? The definition of *attricioun* is inadequate—'Regret (a mild form of contricioun)'—compared with *O.E.D.*, 'An imperfect sorrow for sin'. *austin* n. (2): the solitary quotation does not furnish much proof that this is 'A *kind* of bowl or cup'. *avis*, n. 3 (a): in the quotation from the *Tale of Melibee* amend *amys* to *avys*?

bacheler n. The famous Chaucerian 'A lovyere and a lusty bacheler' figures as an example of meaning 1 (a) 'a young man, a youth', instead of (as Robinson gives it) for meaning 2, 'An aspirant to knighthood'. One would expect examples of the use of *bai-salt* earlier than 1368–9, since the salt trade with Bourgneuf Bay had been in existence since the middle of the thirteenth century. See on this A. R. Bridbury, *England and the Salt Trade in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1955), especially the notes to p. 46. *barat(e* n. The quotation from *Gawain* 21 cited for meaning 3 (a) 'Combat, fighting, battle' would fit as readily into meaning 1 (a) 'Strife, conflict, contention'. Add to *bastard* the quotation (*O.E.D.*) about 'Woollen Cloths called Bastards' (1483)? *Bed(e)nal*: for *Bednell* read *Beadnell*.

Erl n. Is a derivation from OE. *eorl* adequate? *estovers*, n. There must surely be earlier instances of this word than the solitary quotation given. Among the Laing

Charters in the University of Edinburgh, for instance, there is one of 1315 or 1317, dealing with lands in Northumberland, in which the grantees are to be allowed 'a reasonable estover' (*rationabilia estoueria*) in the wood of Langton.

The phrase *frenkysch fare* (*Gawain* 1116) is to be found (the only example) under *Frensh*, adj. Among the cross-references immediately preceding are *frenkis*(*h*→ *Frensh* and *Frenkish*→*Frankish*. *Frankish* adj. has three examples of *frankish fare*. One would have thought it better to show the extent of the use of the phrase under one heading than to split it up in this way; and the cross-referencing is somewhat odd. The arrangement of these articles is made still more complicated by the appearance under *Fransh* of an example of *frenkis* not to be found under *Frensh*.

A. MACDONALD

The Medieval Alexander. By GEORGE CARY. Edited by D. J. A. ROSS. Pp. xvi+416. Cambridge: University Press, 1956. 52*s*. 6*d*. net.

We owe this book, which is by origin and in substance a dissertation submitted for a fellowship, to the devotion of the friends who arranged for its publication after the author's tragic death at the age of twenty-four. It is in two parts. The first is in effect a list, with brief bibliographical information, of both the historical and the legendary texts written about Alexander in Western Europe up to the end of the Middle Ages, with special reference to the lines of descent within each group. The second is an attempt to define, analyse, and account for the conceptions of Alexander current in medieval writings—in fact, an essay in the history of ideas. It is naturally on the second that the major emphasis has been laid.

One of the merits of Mr. Cary's approach to his subject is that he has seen the need to take account of what was said about Alexander by the writers whom he classifies as 'moralists', 'theologians and mystics', and 'preachers' (including the collectors of *exempla*). Much of this material (predominantly in Latin) is quite distinct in origin and kind from what was transmitted in vernacular works deriving ultimately from Pseudo-Callisthenes or the historians: it includes anecdotes from Cicero, Seneca, and Valerius Maximus (such as the story of Diogenes and Alexander, or of Alexander and the pirate, or the letter in which his father rebukes Alexander for prodigal largess aimed at gaining popularity), which were repeated by men such as John of Salisbury for their own purposes. The 'theologians' were concerned with the Biblical passages in Daniel (vii. 6; viii. 3–26; xi. 1 ff.) and 1 Maccabees i. 1–8, with the references to Alexander in Josephus' Ἀρχαιολογία, and with such legends as Alexander's enclosing of Gog and Magog and his celestial journey. The account of these three groups of writings, as it happens, takes up less of Mr. Cary's space than his two chapters on the conception of Alexander among 'secular' writers (which means the more familiar works—mostly vernacular—such as epics and romances). In the latter, what he is chiefly concerned to notice is the attribution to Alexander of such qualities as liberality, or any leanings to a 'courtly' or a 'heroic' conception of him.

The idea behind all this is a good one, and the task was worth doing, even if what emerges from Mr. Cary's analysis is not very startling. The first part of the

book has independent value as a very useful bibliography, which, in combination with the rich information contained in the very extensive notes (pp. 275–351), and the list of works set out on pp. 378–93, constitutes an indispensable aid in this field of study. Indeed, this might appropriately have been published separately, at a commensurate price. The one addition one could wish for here is a list of manuscripts (at least of those works that have not been published, such as Quilichinus of Spoleto's poem).

The plan and execution of Mr. Cary's book are naturally those proper to a dissertation; and if he had been spared, it might profitably have been recast and compressed. It is marked by the appropriate efforts to systematize the material as clearly as possible, to show all one's working, and to help the reader by constantly reminding him of the drift of the argument. But it is in practice repetitive, diffuse, and unduly lavish in quotation: in these days, a reader should not be expected to pay for repeated statements like that of pp. 18 (lines 7–8) and 19 (lines 2–3), or for top-hamper such as this: 'We will first discuss . . . and then proceed to examine . . .' (p. 86); 'Before considering . . . it is essential that . . . should be examined (p. 88); 'We have already considered . . .; we have now to discuss . . .' (p. 118).

A thorough first-hand scrutiny of the prodigiously extensive primary documents that Mr. Cary discusses or mentions would be a task so large that (without disparaging him) one may doubt that it was possible in the time available to him. Indeed, it might be argued that for his purposes, it would, even if possible, have been an unnecessary luxury, since he was concerned with a strictly limited set of ideas, the basis for which was more or less a given one. He has in fact incurred the risks that are inevitable in a survey of a large body of literary works in various languages. The punctuation of the phrase quoted (p. 255) from Gower as 'Philosophie, Entenden, and Astronomie' suggests that the verb *entenden* 'to understand' may have been misinterpreted as a noun and the name for some branch of knowledge; *Entenden* is printed with a capital in editions merely because it happens to stand at the beginning of a line. And one would not gather from the form of statement on pp. 239–40 that the couplet quoted in n. 1 on p. 240 is not to be attributed to the author of *Kyng Alisaunder*. It is metrically inferior, and occurs only in the corrupt Lincoln's Inn MS.; and it may have been cited here only because that manuscript is the one printed by Weber, whose edition Mr. Cary is here following.

We may judge that the author's chief concern is to make main points (founded on suitably detailed argument) regarding the medieval conceptions of Alexander. It is of some help and interest to be told that the courtly conception of Alexander never took hold in England, except in the *Roman de toute Cheualerie*, and that the English works depict him above all as a soldier. But the accompanying comments on them (pp. 241–2) are of dubious value—an assertion that one of them is excellent and the most individual and imaginative (unsupported by reasons or evidence); that Alexander is in this piece 'the idealized . . . but not . . . the heroicized conqueror' (which without further explanation is open to question); that the others 'resemble it in pattern' (again unclear, since they are based on different sources). The interpretation of the reference to Aristotle's teaching as perhaps

due to the *Secreta Secretorum* is interesting, but not assured: another reference in l. 3008 of the same text is taken over from the source, and might (if the source was read in full beforehand) have suggested this one.

Another inevitable consequence of undertaking such a large subject is reliance on secondary sources; and there are signs here of the attendant disadvantages. There are those Middle English scholars, for instance, who would not think it possible to date the alliterative *Alex. A* and *Alex. B* between 1340 and 1370, or to localize them in Gloucestershire, solely on the linguistic evidence, or to decide whether they are by a single author (pp. 48–49): county dialectology is not universally accepted as being a procedure generally applicable to Middle English works.

Mr. Cary's book may be thought over-ambitious by those who believe rigorous accuracy in matters of detail to be essential. But to have assembled and organized the materials presented in it (whatever its imperfections), in a very limited time, is an astonishing achievement for a scholar of such a tender age, and would do credit to anyone. We can only lament the loss to medieval studies of a man of such marked promise. His book should long serve as a starting-point for the study of various individual problems of the Alexander legend, since the second part, as well as the first, provides a wealth of information about materials, sources, and secondary literature. This is its main value; that it was not the author's main purpose does not matter. Dr. D. J. A. Ross has contributed *inter alia* a helpful summary account (pp. 355–7) of recent work on Pseudo-Callisthenes and of an unpublished fifteenth-century redaction of the French prose romance. And the book is elegantly and beautifully printed.

G. V. SMITHERS

The Bibliotheca Historica of Diodorus Siculus translated by John Skelton. Edited by F. M. SALTER and H. L. R. EDWARDS. Vol. I, pp. xviii+396; Vol. II, pp. liv+397–472 (Early English Text Society 233, 239). London: Oxford University Press for the Society, 1956, 1957. 42*s.*, 15*s.* net.

John Skelton's translation of Diodorus is the first English rendering of any work originally Greek, romances like *Apollonius of Tyre* excepted. It was certainly written before 1489; its editors are inclined to date it *c.* 1483. It is also the first major work of the one poet of other than historical interest writing in the period between Chaucer and Wyatt. The addition of the Diodorus to the Early English Text Society list is therefore most welcome. Volume I contains a transcript of the text from the only manuscript (MS. 357, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge) prefaced by a history and description of the manuscript and a definition of the editorial practice. The apparatus also includes citations from the Loeb Classical Library translation of Diodorus's Greek 'wherever Skelton seriously differs . . . in meaning' as well as parallels from Poggio Bracciolini's Latin version, which was Skelton's source. From the samples of the manuscript I have had opportunity to compare, the transcription appears to be scrupulously accurate. Volume II is a miscellany. The Introduction consists of sections concerning Diodorus, Poggio, Skelton's 'dictionary' (Reuchlin's *Vocabularius breuiloquus*), his knowledge of the classics, his rhetoric, and his contribution to the English language,

concluding with an estimate of 'the essential Skelton'. The body of the volume presents some scattered notes on the text, a useful Glossary, and a group of appendixes in which passages are drawn from Skelton's works to illustrate the nature of his classical scholarship.

Skelton declared in 'The Garland of Laurel' that he had translated Diodorus 'Oute of fresshe Latine into owre Englysshe playne . . . Sex volumis engrosid together it doth containe'. The 'sex volumis' correspond to the first five books of Diodorus as we count them, because Poggio divided Book I of the Greek into two. The manuscript of Skelton's version is incomplete, breaking off in the middle of a sentence in chapter 19 of Book IV (or Book V as Poggio and Skelton reckon). Skelton's description of his English as 'playne', if it is not intended merely to refer to the poor resources of the vulgar as compared with the copiousness of the Latin, is perhaps the only note of self-depreciation in his writings. The prose of the translation is in fact one of the most remarkable examples in English of extraordinary syntax, magniloquent vocabulary, and general inflation. The expansion grows as Skelton warms to his task; there is a passage in Book V in which eight words of Latin are made into nearly 200 of English, and this without the addition of a single new idea. The decision of the editors to restrict their citation of the source to passages in which Skelton differs in meaning makes it difficult to study these more significant differences in manner—Poggio's Diodorus is not in everyone's library. The lack is supplied in part by a section of the Introduction which examines Skelton's rhetorical practice and points out some notable examples of *amplificatio*.

The Introduction derives from Dr. Edwards's unpublished Cambridge University dissertation, 'The Humanism of John Skelton', and from Professor Salter's essay, 'John Skelton's Contribution to the English Language' (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd Series, II. xxxix (1945)). According to the Foreword to Volume II, the authors have changed their minds about certain matters since the Introduction was written, and at least one of them (the ambiguity is not the reviewer's) has unhappily concluded that the designation 'humanist' should be applied to 'true Hellenists' only and not to Renaissance scholars and poets like Skelton. There are signs of uncertainty in the Introduction itself: at pages li–lii of Volume II the reader is told that Skelton quotes the French humanist (though not 'true Hellenist') Gaguin only as a chronicler; at pp. 413–14 it is demonstrated that Skelton refers also to Gaguin's *Ars versificatoria*. The section of the Introduction entitled 'The Essential Skelton' is scholarly and judicious, but it concludes by describing the poet's expression as 'the English counterpart of the paganism—of the earthy, joyous paganism—of the high Renaissance'. I hope that this is one of the purplish passages upon which the authors, as they say in the Foreword, now 'look with lack-lustre eye'. Skelton may be earthy and joyous, but he is scarcely a pagan. Nor is the 'high' Renaissance—if Michelangelo, Ronsard, Spenser, and Shakespeare represent it—altogether earthy or joyous, or in any sense pagan. Nevertheless, introduction, appendixes, and notes are full of excellent observations and ingenious solutions of Skeltonic cruxes. No editor of the long-hoped-for edition of Skelton's works can ignore them.

WILLIAM NELSON

The James Carmichaell Collection of Proverbs in Scots. Edited by M. L. ANDERSON. Pp. viii+150. Edinburgh: University Press, 1957. 20*s*. net.

Professor Bruce Dickins first drew attention to this collection in manuscript in Edinburgh University Library, and cited a few items—inaccurately, as would now appear—in an appendix to Beveridge's edition of *Fergusson's Scottish Proverbs* (S.T.S., 1924). The author was unknown, and the relationship to Fergusson obscure. The author is now very plausibly identified, on several grounds, as one James Carmichaell (1543–1628), Presbyterian minister of Haddington, anti-episcopalian refugee in London, lexicographer, witch-hunter, and, in Andrew Melville's phrase, 'profound dreamer'. As to origin, the cardinal principle of proverb-collecting, as of lexicography, is to crib as much as possible from one's predecessors. As Maxwell's *Sum Reasownes and Prowerbes* are lifted from Lyly and Pettie, with a few items from the *Seuin Seages* (Maxwell's manuscript, Mr. Anderson notes, has just come to light), and Ray's Scottish Proverbs from Fergusson, so it would appear that Carmichaell's collection is based on Fergusson's, or on his prototype, with independent expansions. Mr. Anderson claims priority for Carmichaell over Fergusson in point of language, accuracy, and date. The language is generally purer Scots. No doubt Fergusson suffered partial anglicization and modernization at the hands of a commercial printer. Nevertheless, Carmichaell is sometimes inferior to Fergusson in point of reading. As to date, Mr. Anderson claims no more than that the Carmichaell MS. precedes the 1641 printed version of Fergusson. This is true, but as he also dates various proverbs in the Carmichaell MS. 1617 (p. 29), 1619 (p. 28), and 1624 (p. 13), this, in its completed form—if the dates are sound—falls between 1624 and 1628, thus post-dating Fergusson, who died in 1598. Nevertheless, the Carmichaell collection is important. It is early, and can be dated with reasonable accuracy; its language is an epitome of older Scots phraseology; but above all it is notable for the large number of items (591 are claimed), which are apparently unrecorded elsewhere.

The difficulty of the manuscript, with its crabbed hand and interlined entries, of the language, and of interpretation, have given the editor 'a ravelled hesp to redd'. He has acquitted himself well. The glossary and notes are particularly welcome. A few items which perplex or defeat the editor can be solved. He finds the reading of item 290, 'better happie in court nor gude service' for earlier 'hap to court' a significant error indicative of a common origin for Carmichaell and Fergusson. But Fergusson has 'happie to', a better reading than 'happie in'. *Happie*, 'fortunate, lucky', is rather a modernization of the idiom than a change of sense, whereas Mr. Anderson's interpretation 'do one's own business at court . . . rather than rely on another's service, even if one has to hop there', is an obvious error. The sense is 'trust to court favour rather than to (one's own) good service'. The rather contradictory proverbial phrases cited from Cheviot confuse rather than elucidate 580, 'better a March nob nor a Maii lob'. Ray's 'the March sun causeth dust' (p. 11) supports the tentative gloss on *nob*, 'hard soil', and the *E.D.D. all of a lob*, 'muddy', supports *lob*, 'sticky soil'. Item 485 is merely a variant of 483, and a translation of the Latin 62, and Cranstoun's note only

confuses; *ill-warit* is 'ill-spent', from *wair/ware*, 'to spend'. The opposite sense appears in Henderson's 'get weel, keep weel' (p. 52). To take *gorg* as 'a well-dressed man' in 489 on the strength of Norfolk *gorger* is inadmissible, and patently the opposite of the sense intended. This item is only a variant of 'alike ilka day maks a clout on Sunday' (Henderson, p. 49). Item 547 is clarified by Henderson's 'he that fishes before the net, lang ere he fish get'. The Carmichaell reading in 682 (cf. 810) is less, not more, comprehensible than Maxwell; for *rame*, 'roar' read *rain*, retaining internal rhyme (cf. 748, 799, 807) and the obvious sense. Carmichaell's *lipper swyne* is a misunderstanding, perhaps a misreading of an original *lidder/lither swayn* (cf. 104 for *lidder*; here 'lazy'). The editor's interpretation of the obscure 768 could be strengthened by taking *daill* as 'interference' (*E.D.D.*, Sc.) rather than 'someone one has dealings with'. The most interesting parallel to 795 is Chaucer's Friar, 'his purchas was wel bettre than his rente'. In 862 *wadge* is obviously *wage*, 'pledge' (Jamieson), not *wedge*, and *tale*, 'tally', and the sense is 'I shall exact greater security for credit than green cheese'. The interpretation of *mowis* in 866 as 'jests' can be supported by Henderson's 'It's a gude game that fills the wame' (p. 83). Carmichaell, and his editor, misunderstand 732; (*t*)*hrids* should certainly read *huirds*, 'hoards, piles', (cf. Cheviot, p. 147, Henderson, p. 79), and note that Carmichaell's *het* is a correction of *hes*. If *knype* is *knape*, 'boy' in 742, then compare *swyne* in 682; do both arise from *ai/aj*? Murison's suggestion *Heildoun* in 966 at least makes sense, the glossary 'wearing down at the heel' apparently does not. In 1082, if *cattle* is taken as 'chattel' (Metcalfe's Supplement to Jamieson) rather than 'kettle' or 'cattle' as suggested, the sense becomes easier. *Wun wirdie* in 1166, which completely defeats the editor, is *wanwordy* from *wanworth* (Warrack or Jamieson), and the sense is then obvious. In 1237 the combination of adv. and prep. *in on* which worries the editor can be paralleled as early as the OE. Chronicle, a. 893. In 1313 there is no need at all to introduce albinos; cf. 'whitely things are aye tender' ('genteel'; Cheviot, p. 400). Item 1385 is not so obscure if we recognize that Carmichaell's 'sture myne and maw thyne' is a variant of 'saw thin, maw thin' ('sow thin, mow thin'). *Sture* is either 'store, replenish (the earth)' or *stour*, 'sprinkle' (Jamieson, Aberdeen). *Myn*(*e*), if not a misreading, is probably ON. *minni*, 'less, least'.

JOHN BRAIDWOOD

King Henry VIII. Edited by R. A. FOAKES. Pp. lxvi+216 (The Arden Shakespeare [new and revised edition]. General editor: UNA ELLIS-FERMOR). London: Methuen, 1957. 21*s.* net.

The publication of the new Arden *Henry VIII* is a notable event, but not on account of the play's present popularity; rather the contrary. It has fallen from that favourable position it occupied at Mansfield Park, and for this the decline in reading aloud is only in part responsible. Indeed, its impact on modern critical thinking has been so light that recent writers on the Histories (Dr. Tillyard, Professor Lily Campbell, Mr. Derek Traversi) have excluded it from the scope of their inquiries—although, since the publication of Professor Alexander's essay, the plea that it may be dismissed as negligible in the Shakespearian

canon has surely rung hollow. This, the first important edition of the play to be completed since that essay ('Conjectural History, or Shakespeare's Henry VIII') appeared in 1931, is, moreover, an item in an impressive series, the new Arden having given more consideration than the old to the Histories and their significance, and, in other volumes besides these, directed attention towards Shakespeare's reading in the Chronicles.

Mr. Foakes, availing himself of the liberty of arrangement happily allowed to the several editors in this series, divides the material of his introduction into a 'technical' account of text and authorship, date, sources, and stage history, and a 'critical' appreciation, but does not labour the distinction; and he appends to the text substantial extracts from 'Holinshed' and Foxe, together with references to that performance of a play on Henry VIII at which the Globe was burnt down. The copy being fair, with little to challenge attention but the unusual stage-directions, the first part of the 'technical introduction' is occupied mainly with that long-drawn-out campaign in which the first conspicuous engagement was Spedding's article ('Who Wrote Shakespeare's Henry VIII?') in 1850. This may be unavoidable, but has its drawbacks. Thus, the original argument for Fletcher's participation (whether by collaboration or completion and revision), although it employed new and therefore seductive stylistic tests, was not unaffected by old suppositions, since discredited—as, that a tribute to Elizabeth I could not be paid in the presence of James I; and with such complications the writer of an introduction has not room to concern himself. Moreover, recapitulation is likely to give disproportionate space to theories framed before the present critical position regarding 'doubtful' plays (notably *Henry VI*) had been reached—which must be why Professor Alexander's argument receives the acknowledgement merely of a cordial footnote. Mr. Foakes himself sees reason to distrust much of the evidence brought forward by the disintegrators, contingent as it must be on activities of scribe or compositor about which we lack adequate knowledge, and shows how easily the respective shares of the supposed partners may be altered by further considerations of the very kind hitherto employed to support this or that distribution—for there have already been differences of reckoning. His own case for the play's integrity rests provisionally on the consistency in the treatment of historical material which he discerns throughout, on the prevalence of a particular vein of imagery, and a tone of feeling which he characterizes more explicitly in his 'critical introduction'. Is the time ripe for a *Henry VIII* volume in the *Shakespeare Problems* series? Or must that await keener interest in the play? Mr. Foakes dismisses summarily the interdependence of 'considerations of authorship' and 'intrinsic worth'—thereby doing less than justice to his own handling of these related problems. He discusses the date of the play in the context of Princess Elizabeth's wedding and the mood of loyal enthusiasm for royal festivities which he assumes to have survived the occasion by some months, accepts the tradition that it was *this* Henry VIII play which was fatal to the Globe, and arrives at a time for composition and first performance between the wedding (14 February) and the fire (29 June) in 1613.

His textual policy may be characterized as a return to the Folio, against the stream of earlier editors who sought what they supposed better sense or easier

verse cadences. This, generally justifiable, in but one instance of note seems to be pressed too far: the setting out of audible verse as prose in v. ii and iii—conspicuous in a play which lacks prose, and suffers by that lack. In the fullness of its commentary the Arden had already gone part of the way towards a variorum edition—progress which this volume, longer by some fifty pages than its precursor, will not arrest. True, the discussion and thorough illustration of the principal sources in Introduction and Appendix relieve the notes of pressure: they have only to remark movement in the direction of Halle or Speed, or independence. Yet Mr. Foakes does not always let well alone. His explanations of idiom are sometimes minute enough to prompt the question: for whom is all this intended? Doubtless it is merely a sign of the times to find words and phrases familiar to any reader of the Authorized Version (and how many there are in this play!) treated as obscure archaisms; it may still be urged, however, that an archaic form or usage needs glossing no more than once. (See II. iii. 97 and III. ii. 5.) Perhaps this is not a very gracious response to the editor's labours on behalf of readers to whom the language of the play will often present difficulties, since, in the too frequent absence of the chief characters, there is not enough momentum of thought or feeling to keep the channels of communication clear; but in one instance at least it would have been better to refrain. It is an old joke against singers that they spoil the opening lines of the play's one song by allowing Orpheus to *make trees*—yet they do it involuntarily by faulty phrasing, and not, like Mr. Foakes, by suggesting that a past tense might be substituted for a wholly satisfactory infinitive (which, faithful to the Folio, he nevertheless preserves in the text).

> Orpheus with his lute made trees,
> And the mountain tops that freeze
> Bowed themselves when he did sing

would be bad mythology, bad sense, and bad poetry. Furthermore, if metrical variations are to be noted, an edition of the standing of the Arden should be scrupulous in its use of terms: an English line of twelve syllables in alternating stress is not an hexameter. (See I. ii. 180 and IV. ii. 92).

Mr. Foakes's critical appreciation is too full and detailed to be adequately discussed here, but a major contention may fairly be challenged. He aligns *Henry VIII* with *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest*—at their expense: they are levelled down, the characters described as 'depersonalized', the magic as an expedient. To me, doubtful of the wisdom of this approach, it appears not only that *their* merits suffer in the comparison, but also that some quality of strength, or at least of astringency, in *this* play is overlooked. The compassionate mood on which he rightly insists springs from a sharper recognition of suffering than his interpretation admits: it breeds distrust to be told of the 'youth and beauty' of Anne as 'compensation' for the rejection of Katherine, or the 'rise of Wolsey' (surely Cranmer must be intended?) as juxtaposed with the fall of Buckingham to bring about a joyful culmination; and, while hope is indeed associated, here as in the last plays, with the rising generation, yet, to realize how diversely this must operate in history and romance, we have only

to imagine Perdita's home-coming relegated to a prophetic vision and qualified by the knowledge that her mother must first die on the scaffold. Moreover, to dwell thus exclusively on the themes of reconciliation and regeneration is to miss the opportunity of setting *Henry VIII* in a more significant context—the whole range of Shakespeare's strangely diversified treatment of English history. How do the play's rhetoric and pageantry compare with those of *Henry V*?—or its realism with that of *Henry IV*? What may we learn about the Elizabethan dramatist, his audience, his England, from the sympathy, even veneration, he asks for Katherine and More in a world which thought *dynastically*? What insight into our own insularity (for good and ill) may we gain from his poignant sense of exile—even in the case of an alien on English soil? This play's treatment of the historical theme may be consistent, but it is not simple. How are we to understand its allusions to the pageantry of the royal wedding in view of the persistently unflattering reflections on the court that run through it? Though some of these may be required by the plot, and the reflections on ostentation can be fastened upon Wolsey, there remain uncompromising reminders that human bodies crowded together sweat noticeably, and none the less for being loaded with finery; a consideration overlooked by those who would make a courtier of Shakespeare. All this, doubtless, is only to admit that *Henry VIII* is a formidable undertaking for any editor.

MARY LASCELLES

Philip Massinger. The Man and the Playwright. By T. A. DUNN. Pp. xii+286. Edinburgh: Nelson, for the University College of Ghana, 1957. 30*s*. net.

Massinger is perhaps the least loved of the well-known dramatists of the seventeenth century. There was little enthusiasm for his plays in his own day, and there has been little enthusiasm since. It does not seem to be the wish of Dr. Dunn, who has written the first 'full-length' study of Massinger to appear for many years, that we should learn to love Massinger more.

Following a full biographical account, Dr. Dunn considers in turn Plotting, Stagecraft, Characterization, Criticism of Life, Style. He finds most to praise in Massinger's 'plotting', or the designs of his plays, though he sees serious weaknesses in the structure of more than half of Massinger's independent plays. He explains that 'artistic conscience always succumbs to the conscience of the moralist'. On stagecraft, Dr. Dunn is hampered by his use of Gifford (e.g. p. 79), but he has useful things to say about the absence of physical description of the setting or the characters. Massinger's characterization is found unsatisfactory, and 'the root cause of our dissatisfaction' is the 'subordination of character to plot (the plot itself being subordinated to moral purpose)' (p. 135). Another cause (pp. 138–9) is that probability cannot inhere in 'a convention of dramatic entertainment in which improbable surprises were all part of the game', and 'a critic who looks at them from outside the convention . . . tends to lose all faith in the characters; he cannot see any real individuality in them at all'. Massinger's comic characters are 'scarcely worth consideration'; 'Massinger was a fundamentally serious man trying to be funny'. The chapter on Criticism of Life is an attempt

to assemble Massinger's *credo*, 'extricated or deduced article by article from its bedding or matrix in what are primarily and principally plays'. Concerning Massinger's style, Dr. Dunn writes at some length to prove that it is unsuitable for the stage. He finds it a good example of the dissociation of sensibility, the vice which 'spread like a sclerosis in seventeenth-century poetry' (p. 257). He finds the verse grey, flat, lacking in spontaneity and vividness, lacking in human feeling, over-elaborate in syntax, and indistinguishable from prose. He closes his study, in fact, with imagining Massinger's exclaiming with M. Jourdain that he must have been writing prose all his life.

The weakness of Dr. Dunn's method of discussing one by one the different aspects of Massinger's dramatic work is that he never has the opportunity of extended criticism of a single play. Characterization and Style are not subjects in themselves, but a means to an end in any one play, and they can be profitably judged only in relation to individual plays. Moreover, Dr. Dunn is fond of casual and derogatory judgements which are not supported by critical argument. *The Picture* is 'this ridiculous play'; *The Emperor of the East* is 'full of talk' but 'has little real action [and] leaves a very unsatisfactory impression. It seems in an undefinable way to lack unity of purpose.' It seems at times that Dr. Dunn quite misunderstands the meaning of plays he thus brushes aside. I find it inexplicable that the balanced treatment of slaves and masters in *The Bondman* should be called 'a somewhat dubious juggling with our sympathies' (p. 165). It is similarly surprising that the last act of *The Fatal Dowry* should be called 'the welter of words and quibbling about the murder' (p. 96) designed to show that 'no individual should take the law into his own hands' (p. 67). Dr. Dunn does not refer to Professor Waith's most helpful identification of the source of *The Fatal Dowry* as one of Seneca's *Controversiae* (*P.M.L.A.*, lxviii (1953), 286–303), but, even without reference to the source, his reading of the play is so bizarre that one wishes for further explanation.

Dr. Dunn expresses the hope that his study will do something 'towards asserting Massinger's right to a serious reconsideration, if not as a dramatist of major importance, then at least as one of real interest'. But while it is easy to compile a list of what Dr. Dunn dislikes in Massinger, it is exceedingly hard to discover what he finds excellent, or even interesting. The dramatic convention in which he worked is referred to as 'cloak-and-dagger romance'; we learn that he was 'too honest and too single-minded (not to mention too unsubtle in mind), and perhaps too humane', too much lacking in wit and humour and poise, to be a successful satirist; 'his almost invariable practice' in writing verse is 'a rag-bag method of throwing figures together'; his use of syntax shows 'an inelastic mind' and there is a 'precise pedantry' in his use of metaphors. It is hard to escape the conclusion that Dr. Dunn has little sympathy with Massinger's mind, personality, or dramatic art. And since it is most certainly true that Massinger has a claim to a reconsideration as a thoroughly interesting dramatist, it is a pity that the present study is unlikely to make the unconverted reach for their Giffords and reread the plays.

PHILIP EDWARDS

English Sentimental Drama. By ARTHUR SHERBO. Pp. x+182. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1957. $4.50.

The gist of Professor Sherbo's book is to be found in his statement: 'Sentimental drama presents a problem that has more ramifications than seem to have been realized by many scholars.' He examines these ramifications, and demonstrates that the problem is really one of isolating sentimental drama from the many plays that contain only sentimental scenes or characters.

He shows, with a wide range of reference, that a strongly moral element and an exaggerated emphasis on pity for virtuous sufferers are often to be found in Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Restoration plays, but the plays themselves cannot be classed as sentimental because their authors' emphases lie elsewhere. Even *Love's Last Shift* (so often mentioned as the first sentimental comedy) is not properly placed in this category because 'the Loveless Amanda story is only one of a number of interests that demanded the attention of spectators'. Of these interests, humour is the one that militates most against the sentimental.

This leads the writer to the sensible statement that certain stock themes and situations have been accepted for too long as the criteria of sentimental drama. The proper criterion should be the treatment accorded them. Mr. Sherbo gives many examples to prove his points. One that he does not mention may also be cited in his support. Vanbrugh's *The Relapse* contains a scene (v. iii) that has many of the elements of sentimental comedy. The heroine, Amanda, suffers for virtue, but when the rakish Worthy attempts to seduce her, she so impresses him with her chastity that he repents. His speech is brief; it appears perfunctory and bathetic. If Vanbrugh had wanted to give a truly sentimental effect, he should have drawn out the repentance to much greater length. Even then, the gusty humour of the surrounding scenes would have revealed the incongruity of this situation.

Mr. Sherbo rightly insists on the fact that repetition and emphasis count for everything in theatrical effect. To achieve even stage credibility, the writer of sentimental drama had to prolong his situations and draw out his effects as (though for different reasons) Richardson did in *Clarissa*. The connexion was noticed by contemporaries, and there is an interesting *London Magazine* criticism here of Frances Sheridan's *The Discovery*: 'The last act is rather a Richardsonian narration than part of a dramatic action.'

It is not so easy to agree with the author when he claims that writers of sentimental drama were insincere. There have been periods in our history when to revel in mawkish emotion has been the sign of a sensitive and delicate nature. When we recall, too, that the eighteenth century saw convulsions and storms of tears as fairly common reactions to Whitefield's sermons and Mrs. Siddons's acting, it becomes difficult to pronounce on sincerity or otherwise of writers who sought to stir audiences in the same way.

Nor do I think that the author of *The Fugitive* can be accurately described as 'obscure'. Joseph Richardson was part-proprietor of the *Morning Post* and of the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, and achieved some distinction as contributor to *The Rolliad* and to *Probationary Odes*.

Altogether, this is a stimulating and thought-provoking book. Mr. Sherbo takes nothing for granted, makes careful distinctions, and argues his case cogently and well. CECIL PRICE

Samuel Johnson in Grub Street. By EDWARD A. BLOOM. Pp. xii+310. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 1957. $6.00.

American scholarship has done so much for Johnson in recent years that little seems to remain unexplored. Not long since, Mr. Hoover in his deft account of Johnson as parliamentary reporter showed that one province at least had been overlooked. Now Mr. Bloom concentrates on Johnson the journalist, whose integrity and skill prepared the triumph of Johnson the renowned man of letters. Thus we have the workshop side of the story told in the second half of *Young Samuel Johnson*: naturally it is treated in much greater detail, and extended into the middle years, because Johnson played a conspicuous part in one journalistic venture of the 1750's and contributed articles and advice to others. Mr. Bloom's study is exhaustive, accurate, and at times illuminating. He has made a patient examination of everything Johnson wrote, however slight and fugitive; he summarizes carefully, even when the piece in question can be consulted without difficulty; he discusses the claims of possible entrants to the canon with good sense. The result is an estimable work, the scale of which seems a little out of proportion to its uses. This complaint broaches a question of method.

Mr. Bloom's book comprises seven chapters, of differing value, and two appendixes, on 'Some Fugitive Pieces' and 'The Journalistic Canon'. The opening chapter describes very fully the work Johnson did for the *Gentleman's Magazine*; the second presents his associates of the time, again in full detail. Both these chapters were bound to repeat and amplify much that is familiar. Next, he examines Johnson's connexion with the *Literary Magazine* and other periodicals of the same decade: this is a useful survey. The fourth chapter relates the history of the *Rambler*, the *Adventurer*, and the *Idler*, and then collects (mainly from these) Johnson's views on authorship and analyses them. The next chapter inspects his work as reviewer, which at least once, in the attack on Soame Jenyns's *Free Inquiry*, raised reviewing far above the mediocrity of its usual practice. Then follow, in two final chapters, an excellent study of the copyright question and Johnson's stand in the matter, and another of his attitude to a free press. Parts of these chapters appeared some years ago as articles.

It will be seen that the design of Mr. Bloom's book had inconveniences. Nearly all the particular aspects of Johnson's journalistic career have been treated separately and well by others. A complete survey of the ground is helpful, but involves rather much compilation. Mr. Bloom is, indeed, able to add certain new points: for example, he shows that an essay in the *Universal Visiter* on *The Rise of Architecture*, ascribed to Johnson by Hawkins, leans heavily on Chambers's *Cyclopaedia*—and Johnson abhorred plagiarism. A scrutiny of Johnson's essays on current affairs in the *Literary Magazine* shows that he was independent in politics as in other things. Johnson's great gifts, his range of mind, his impressive

achievement in a squalid profession, stand out more clearly from a reading of this conscientious inquiry.

There are pedestrian passages when Mr. Bloom is reviewing the various contributions of Johnson to the journalism of his age, and sometimes one feels a certain limpness in the quality of Mr. Bloom's critical judgement, especially on the poems. This is not to impugn the general soundness of his views on the debatable pieces. The book is clearly but not vigorously written. It could with advantage have been briefer, more pointed, perhaps more mobile. As it is, Mr. Bloom's study provides a convenient survey of Johnson's journalism in all its aspects. However, as the works of scholarship accumulate, we should strive in our common interest for economy: to say only what we must, and to say it well.

HENRY GIFFORD

Symbol and Image in William Blake. By GEORGE WINGFIELD DIGBY. Pp. xx+143, 77 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. 35*s.* net.

'With a work of art, the essential thing is to experience it. To experience is not the same thing as to understand. It is one thing to enter into the imaginative world of one of Blake's pictures, his poems, or his myths and to feel the images with their strange and unaccountable vistas awakening within. But it is quite another thing to give a satisfactory account of this experience in terms of the understanding.' These four sentences open the third of Mr. Digby's three chapters, that 'On the Understanding of Blake's Art', of which the first nine pages are the central and most important part of this important book. No summary can do justice to them, but one may put it like this. By means of the pictorial images or symbols which Jung calls archetypes pictorial art communicates. We by our own intuition can experience the work of art and so receive the communication. Then, but not till then, we can set out to understand.

I find Mr. Digby's book exciting and I feel no doubt at all about his fundamental rightness. He puts Los and Urizen in their respective places. His aim is to contribute to the understanding of Blake, but he is aware that understanding can often not catch up with experience. Yet it can, I am sure, deepen experience. We must undoubtedly start by experiencing. That can be followed by a partial understanding. That helps towards a deeper experience. And so on. Indeed this seems implied in Mr. Digby's own introductory stress on 'the right understanding of Blake's symbols and images; they are the language by means of which the intuitive imagination expresses itself, and for Blake this was a live language, not a dead one'.

The symbols and images are explained in the light of Jung's psychology and of a basic resemblance between Jung's psychology and Blake's. This resemblance has often been noticed, but Mr. Digby is the first to use it primarily, though not exclusively, for Blake's pictorial work. His book makes a special study of the *Gates of Paradise* series and of the Arlington Court picture. These are all reproduced, and there are about fifty other pictorial reproductions. The argument is supported by numerous references to Blake's writings, which in their turn receive illumination from it.

The Gates of Paradise, 'For Children', was published in 1793. Long afterwards (1818 is the provisionally accepted date) it was reissued 'For the Sexes', with additional plates containing the five introductory couplets, the twenty-five couplets of 'The Keys of the Gates', and the two quatrains 'To the Accuser who is The God of This World'. Mr. Digby expounds the later version, pictures and verses. To this exposition the picture numbered 6, 'At length for hatching ripe he breaks the shell', is central. The four couplets about it begin 'I rent the Veil where the Dead dwell'. In the light of that he must be right in explaining that 'This picture indicates the state of man when he first seriously realizes that there is something basically wrong with his view of the world, and that all his efforts have so far only served further to confound and enmesh him. It points to a very important turning-point in life, the moment when the age of experience . . . is accepted as such. It is a sort of second birth'. Yet I suggest that in 1793, 'For Children', the picture meant first or physical birth. After a quarter of a century Blake, being Blake, was bound to find more meaning in his original image. The full understanding of Blake requires an awareness of the chronology of Blake. The (more important) experiencing of Blake requires only that opening 'Of Man inwards' which was precisely Blake's declared aim.

The Arlington Court picture Mr. Digby calls 'Regeneration'. It depicts Man with Jung's light and dark anima and the shadow. In the chariot at the top is the 'Real Human' (a certain identification from *Milton*). Man is shown about to accept the whole of his personality. Thus the 'Real Human' will awake, and he will be regenerated.

I disagree with some details, e.g. the river at the bottom (Styx or Lethe?) cannot be one of the four rivers of Paradise. They are the four small figures on the hill-side, the pair being Hiddekel (Tigris) and Euphrates. I do not think the press controversy about a literary source for this picture is a controversy at all. Of course it had a literary source (or sources). So had 'The Ancient of Days', which, according to Blake's own statement, was nevertheless intuitive and archetypal. Mr. Digby has not been considering sources. His study is different, more fundamental, but the two kinds of study are complementary not contradictory—in Blake's terminology contraries, not negations.

This picture may even have a partial 'source' in the personal circumstances of Colonel Chichester, who presumably commissioned it.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Edited by KATHLEEN COBURN. Vol. I 1794–1804. Text, pp. xlii+546; Notes, pp. xlvi+616. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957. 75*s.* net.

For the whole forty years of his adult life (1794–1834) Coleridge used notebooks which have survived. Fifty-six are now in the British Museum, ten in the Victoria College Library, Toronto. Some are small pocketbooks suitable for use on journeys, others larger and more for desk use. One might be filled consecutively in a couple of months, another laid aside and taken into use again

more than once after intervals of years. The notebooks contain consecutive accounts of tours or of reading matter (abstracts and extracts); they also contain all sorts of miscellaneous entries, imaginative or trivial, philosophical or jocular, personal, pathetic, or coarse. There are lines which were used in poems: there are no drafts of the great poems. Roughly speaking, the notebooks (as far as here published) were not used for original composition. They sometimes seem the sort of notebooks filled by other men, not geniuses, but one has no sooner made a provisional generalization about them than one finds it contradicted. There is much less detailed account of illness than in the letters, and not much self-reproach till 1803. They show a Coleridge who is busily observant (including observation of his inner self), with wide-ranging curiosity, 'a library cormorant', but show only comparatively rare traces of the passion of the poems or even of the letters.

Since Coleridge's death the notebooks were drawn upon for *Anima Poetae* (1895). The 'Gutch' notebook was printed, with many erroneous transcriptions, in 1896. Sir Edmund Chambers, Mr. Lawrence Hanson, and the late Humphry House all drew on them, but anything short of complete publication is seldom satisfactory. This vast task Miss Coburn has devotedly undertaken. Her method is that of the 'double volume', two volumes, Text and Notes, each called Volume I. The complete work is to consist of five double volumes and a final single volume 'containing a subject index, addenda and corrigenda'.

An effort, usually successful, has been made to date each entry in each notebook. The entries have then been printed, irrespective of which notebook they come from, in an order which is, as far as possible, chronological, except that the 'Gutch' book (approximately 1795–9) is printed in its own order. The volume before us presents 1,842 entries, the latest of January 1804 just before Coleridge left Grasmere for London on the way to Malta. Fifteen of the sixty-six notebooks contribute to this ten-year period. Notes, roughly equal in aggregate bulk to the entries themselves, show Miss Coburn indefatigable in elucidation, illustration, translation (from Latin, Greek, or German), and in all that Coleridgean background on which the author of *The Road to Xanadu* set scholars spying and speculating. There are massive indexes, and tables showing when each notebook was used. I can think of nothing which Miss Coburn might have done which she has not done, and, though the two volumes of excellent paper are heavy to handle and turning from one to the other suggests the grasshopper of Ecclesiastes, I can think of no alternative method which would have been an improvement. The only fault is an occasional verbosity, e.g. in such a sentence as 'the margins are frayed and [in] some [cases] have been folded in', where I have put the tiresome little redundancies in brackets. Does no one now read Q.'s *Interlude on Jargon*?

The simplest way to emphasize the importance of these volumes is to say that any attempt to write a new life of Coleridge must obviously wait until the whole series is published (and also until E. L. Griggs's edition of the *Letters* is completed). It will provide a new tool for Coleridge study in the same sort of way as the *O.E.D.* did for the editing of English texts.

I append a few suggestions for the *addenda* and *corrigenda* in the final volume.

Entry

44 The translation in the note needs revision. *possim* is first person—'fallen into a deep pool so that I can neither touch the bottom nor swim to the top'. Perhaps not a quotation but Coleridge describing his own sensations.

373 If Coleridge wrote 'Bělōvēd', it was the merest slip. He is exemplifying 'Amphibrachys', i.e. long syllable enclosed in two shorts.

406 Where did Coleridge find these wrong dates? His arithmetic (up to 1066 presumably) is wrong too.

597 What is the conundrum?

712 note. The 'first months of the new century' were not in 1800.

1002 λογον is misprinted λογοι. The *Phaedrus* reference is c. 54 (270 C). Coleridge's translation of τῆς τοῦ ὅλου φύσεως as 'the whole of nature' is a howler even worse than his lifelong mistake in thinking Ἔστησε was intransitive.

1283 Surely *tacita* which makes sense and scans, not *tanta* which does neither. And surely the translation should show that it is the absent friend whose silence had to be endured—curiously prophetic of Coleridge's silences from Italy.

1293 Text reads 'emeω', note 'emew'.

1335 should mean that, in the ordinary understanding of the phrase, Man has an *imperium* within Nature's *imperium*. What does the note 'Man is fitted for governing within a government, or under authority' mean?

1636 γυκτ is presumably a misprint for λυκτ (looked).

and perhaps

1391 which is strangely suggestive of the God who is 'a watry vision of Man' in Blake's *Vala*, Night III.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

Italy and the English Romantics. The Italianate Fashion in Early Nineteenth-Century England. By C. P. BRAND. Pp. xii+286. Cambridge: University Press, 1957. 35*s*. net.

Twenty or thirty years ago Professor Ronald Marshall of Columbia University, observing that 'the rôle of Italy in English Literature' had been pretty fully explored from Chaucer to Milton, but from then onwards somewhat neglected, set out to fill the gap. He planned three volumes, to cover 'the decline of the Renaissance interest, the origins of the romantic, and the triumph of the romantic, supplemented by the Victorian'. Only one volume has appeared, *Italy in English Literature 1755–1815: Origins of the Romantic Interest in Italy* (1934), in which some 700 books published during these sixty years are dealt with. Not very surprisingly Professor Marshall seems to have failed to carry his ambitious enterprise to a conclusion.

Dr. C. P. Brand has now stepped into the breach. His contribution covers only the first forty years or so of the nineteenth century, but he has widened the scope of his survey to include the arts in general and also the contemporary scene. This has, of course, added to the difficulties of his task, from which he emerges with credit. Following introductory chapters on travellers in Italy after 1815, on the exiled Italians, and on the study of the Italian language in England, we are given three substantial sections dealing respectively with the influence of

Italian poetry, prose fiction, and drama on English writers, with the fine arts, and (rather skimpily) with history, politics, and religion.

There is nothing startlingly new in the general conclusions to which Dr. Brand's full and careful exposition of the evidence has led him. The increased and more fruitful interest in things Italian which dates from about 1800 sprang from a variety of causes, among them the growing sense of historical perspective, the turning away (general throughout Europe) from French neo-classicism, and that subtle change of sensibility which made the word 'romantic' a key-word after 1800 as 'picturesque' had been previously. There is an interesting discussion of these terms in chapter 11, 'The Appeal of the Italian Scene', which might perhaps have been placed earlier with advantage.

Near the close of his study Dr. Brand commits himself to the emphatic statement: 'By 1840 the fashionable interest in Italy had declined; by 1850 it had largely disappeared.' This seems open to question. The drop in editions and translations of Italian books published in England, cited as evidence, is not a very safe guide, since changed material conditions were making it easier to learn Italian and to buy Italian books on the spot. Nor is it convincingly shown that there was any real lessening of interest in at any rate two of the greatest of the Italian writers, Dante and Boccaccio. According to Paget Toynbee the *Inferno* was translated forty-four times between 1840 and 1920, and twenty-three of these translations were continued to cover the whole *Commedia*. Undiminished interest in the *Decameron* is amply evidenced in chapter vi of Professor H. G. Wright's *Boccaccio in England from Chaucer to Tennyson* (1957), which unfortunately appeared too late for Dr. Brand to profit by its perusal. It would, in fact, be difficult to point to any well-known figure between 1800 and 1840, with the exception of Byron and Shelley, more powerfully influenced, in various ways, by Italy than the Brownings, Swinburne, Meredith, and (of course) the Pre-Raphaelites. Even in music the rise of Wagner did not spell the eclipse of Verdi; and similarly in literature German was studied, by Matthew Arnold and George Eliot for example, side by side with Italian.

Dr. Brand admits frankly that his originating interest was in pure literature, and the five chapters which deal with this part of the subject are the most successful. The arrangement involves, perhaps inevitably, some overlapping and repetition. The treatment of Byron and Shelley, conspicuously, has to be parcelled out among the various topics in this section, and even then both poets reappear in later chapters. Yet one hesitates to suggest that an arrangement by individual English writers and artists might be preferable; for though it would have thrown into greater prominence the outstanding *italianità* of Byron and Shelley, it might otherwise have worked out no more tidily than the scheme actually adopted. The book certainly does justice to Byron's achievement in naturalizing, in *Don Juan* and elsewhere, the Italian 'medley' style of Pulci, Boiardo, and Ariosto, and to Shelley's profound understanding of and admiration for Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, especially the first two. The splitting of *The Triumph of Life* between pp. 60–68 (Dante) and pp. 96–98 (Petrarch) does, however, prevent Dr. Brand from bringing out fully the remarkable *harmonizing* of the two influences in that magnificent fragment. The general plan is, of course,

Petrarchan; but metrically and in style, though, as Dr. Brand observes, Shelley often adopts a freer and looser movement than either of his Italian exemplars, he does in certain passages (notably the lines on Napoleon, 215–34) achieve a more truly Dantesque effect than is to be found anywhere else in English. A few years ago Mr. Stephen Spender, in a rather carelessly written sketch of Shelley's career, remarked that 'he was a prolific inventor of forms, but they are not forms in which anyone is interested today'. If this is still true of the *terza rima* as handled in *The Triumph of Life* and *Ode to the West Wind*, so much the worse for modern poets, one is tempted to say.

The present writer does not feel competent to 'speak as a critick', in the Johnsonian sense, of the chapters less directly concerned with pure literature; but he does feel free to observe that they appear to show a less secure grip. There is more dependence on recent authorities, the discussion of political events is left in the air since the story of Italian nationalism did not culminate till long after 1840, and the treatment of music and pictorial art becomes much more an account of mere fashion than is that of imaginative literature—surprisingly little, for instance, being said about Blake's illustrations to Dante. Even so, these chapters may serve well enough as background material for the student of early nineteenth-century literature.

The standard of factual accuracy is consistently high; there seem to be very few slips or misprints. On p. 49 'Watson' should be 'Warton', and on p. 163, in the quotation from Charlotte Waldie, 'Fame' should be 'Fane'. The metre of *The Faerie Queene* is misleadingly described as modelled on that of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (p. 73). On 221, six lines from the foot, some phrase like 'to be influenced' must have dropped out after 'established'. The mention of that oddity John Taafe (p. 58) might have been amplified a little from the pages of C. L. Cline's *Byron, Shelley and their Pisan Circle* (1952). It is incorrect, by the way, to describe Taafe's as 'the first English commentary on the *Commedia*'; the 1819 edition of Cary's translation included copious notes generally acknowledged to have been the starting-point of all later English commentaries. The only other omissions of any consequence are of George Darley, the poet and art critic (see the *Life and Letters* by C. C. Abbott, 1928) and of the omni-curious diarist Henry Crabb Robinson, whose stay in Italy (1829–31) gained him the friendship of G. B. Niccolini, the poet and dramatist. More remarkable is the fact that Robinson seems to be the only well-known Englishman who ever met that unhappy recluse and great poet, Leopardi (Robinson's *Diary*, ed. T. Sadler (1872), ii. 113).

R. W. KING

Georgina Hogarth and the Dickens Circle. By ARTHUR A. ADRIAN. Pp. xvi+320. London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 30*s.* net.

Professor Adrian has set himself a difficult task. Georgina Hogarth's life was devoted entirely first to the care and later to the memory of her famous brother-in-law. To a large extent her life was his life. Her biographer must therefore repeat an already well-known story, but he must also convince his reader that there is a significant difference in his version. It seems unlikely that anyone will

so much as think of reading this book unless he is already interested in Dickens, and the light which it throws on Dickens is the primary justification of the work. Mr. Adrian has taken care to choose Georgina's angle of vision and to exclude from consideration those aspects of Dickens's career in which she had no concern. Dickens is already a young man of twenty-two when the narrative opens, and by the end of the first chapter Georgina has already taken her sister Mary's place in her brother-in-law's household and come to live at Devonshire Terrace; the first writings to receive more than passing notice are *The Life of Our Lord* and *A Christmas Carol*, the only novels to receive much attention are *David Copperfield* and *Bleak House*, and Mrs. Dickens's *What Shall We Have for Dinner?* takes a more prominent place in Mr. Adrian's narrative than *Little Dorrit*. Clearly the reader who knows nothing about Dickens's career will receive a distorted impression. But if he is adequately informed already, he will profit by this carefully restricted domestic view.

None of the early biographers entirely concealed Dickens's domestic unhappiness, but during the last twenty-five years so much prominence has been given to his separation from his wife and his infatuation for Ellen Ternan that there is some danger of accepting unqualified the statements made to Miss Storey by his daughter, Mrs. Perugini: 'My father was a wicked man—a very wicked man. . . . Nothing could surpass the misery and unhappiness of our home.' There is plenty of evidence to modify this view, much of it supplied to Miss Storey by Mrs. Perugini herself. But doubts have lingered. Mrs. Dickens has appeared a more sympathetic figure than her husband, and Georgina has been regarded as 'a clever and ruthless schemer bent on usurping the position of her sister'. Mr. Adrian has set himself to redress the balance. In the process he has perhaps done less than justice to Mrs. Dickens. She seems to have been clumsy and lethargic, poorly endowed with intellect, and ill equipped for the task of managing a large household, bearing ten children, and understanding the waywardness of a man of genius. Incompatibility of temperament was apparent even in the days of their courtship. But in justice to her it should not be forgotten that her daughter recalled her as 'a sweet, kind, peace-loving woman, a lady—a lady born', and that by her power of sympathy she won the affection of that difficult guest Hans Andersen, during his all too long visit to Gadshill: 'I know none in his books', he said, 'who, in beauty of character and lovableness, comes nearer to her than Agnes.' Nevertheless it was Georgina who kept the household together, and effectually ministered to Dickens's domestic needs. So much was already known, and if Mr. Adrian had had to rely for his narrative and characterization upon what was in print, he might have failed to convince us that his task was worth undertaking or even possible to undertake. But besides being able to draw upon the memories of those who knew her, he has had access to two important manuscript sources, the letters Georgina wrote over a period of forty-four years to Mrs. James T. Fields and the letters she wrote to Dickens's solicitor Ouvry. With this material he is able to reveal as the good genius of Dickens's household a woman not merely shrewd in her assessment of human motives, capable, and intellectually sympathetic, but boundlessly loyal and affectionate. Though Andersen saw Catherine Dickens as the original of Agnes Wickfield, it is clear

that it was Georgina upon whom Agnes and also Esther Summerson were modelled. It is also clear that she did nothing to precipitate the domestic separation, that she did what she could to hold the marriage together, that to her was owing a large measure of such happiness as Dickens was capable of enjoying at Gadshill, and that her charity even embraced Ellen Ternan.

Georgina lived for thirty-seven years after Dickens's death, long enough to survive her sister, Ellen Ternan, and all but two of Dickens's children. Perhaps it is not necessary to know what happened to them, any more than it is necessary to learn the fate of those minor characters which Dickens was yet so careful to relate in the last chapters of his novels. Yet Charley, Mamie, 'Plorn', and 'Hoshen Peck', to name but a few, had become so familiar in the Letters that curiosity is gratified in the finishing of tales left half told. All of them are seen through the eyes of 'Aunty', a glance which is sometimes outraged, sometimes patient, but predominantly affectionate and forgiving. More important in this section of the book is her view of her work as joint-editor of the Letters and as guardian of the 'Beloved Memory'. All was to be suppressed which did not redound to Dickens's credit and which revealed too starkly the cause and effect of his marital unhappiness. It was done with the best intentions, but it was a distorted view of her hero that she endeavoured to preserve.

There is some merit in having recorded these long years of the Dickensian sequel, and there is more in having done justice to her memory, and in having displayed this amiable type of Victorian womanhood. But the principal merit of the book lies in helping to review once more our estimate of Dickens's character and personality. Difficult he certainly was, and reprehensible in his treatment of his wife. It is possible to understand what his daughter meant when she called him a very wicked man. But he inspired unswerving affection and loyalty in the amiable, upright, and somewhat commonplace woman who knew him best. We are bound to ask, I think, whether the darker colours of his mind should be allowed to predominate in a final estimate. JOHN BUTT

Joseph Conrad. Achievement and Decline. By THOMAS MOSER. Pp. xii+228. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 25s. net.

Joseph Conrad. Discovery in Design. By ROBERT F. HAUGH. Pp. x+174. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1957. $3.75.

These two books, differing in scope and intention, both belong to that new kind of criticism which may be called the School of the Psychological Grid. Mr. Moser will not equate Conrad's life with the psychological pattern he discerns in the novels, although . . . . He is altogether more cautious and diffident than Housman's most recent biographer, and even goes so far as to apologize for his Freudian approach—the sophomores will all at least have read their Erich Fromm. More than a third of the book is a study of 'The uncongenial subject: love's tangled garden'. Woman is associated with images of strangling fertility in the early Malayan works; she is powerful and dangerous to a manly

hero, who is yet weak in her presence, and often dogged by an elderly rival. Conrad's decline is attributed to his pursuit of the uncongenial subject. Mr. Moser acclaims *Lord Jim*, the masterpiece, *The Nigger*, *Youth*, *Typhoon*, *Amy Foster*, *Nostromo*, *Under Western Eyes*, *The Secret Agent*, and *The Secret Sharer*. Although he has an early chapter on Conrad's positive achievements, he is engaged principally in plotting the decline. And I find in his own work a corresponding declension. He begins with caution; he ends by remarking with casual assurance on Captain Whalley's incestuous love for his daughter and Massey's and Van Wyk's homosexual attraction to the old captain (p. 218, n. 32), or insisting that Conrad 'calls particular attention to the phallic-shaped object in Marlow's hand' (p. 129) when this is described by one clause in a descriptive catalogue. Marlow is bringing in the boat at the end of *Youth*; the object in question is an oar. A tiller would not have been much better, I suppose.

Mr. Moser's book is extremely interesting, well documented, and written for the most part with moderation; it has a fascination of its own, which is, however, the fascination of a case history, of a psychological reduction of Conrad the writer, if not Conrad the man. His literary judgements are correspondingly abrupt and peremptory, as in his dismissing of *Falk* and *The End of the Tether* (p. 7). Every character is treated as being a character in the same quasi-naturalist sense; thus the peculiar distortions of *The Secret Agent* are not allowed to modify Mr. Moser's approach, and consequently his treatment of this and other middle novels is relatively cursory. Winnie Verloc is 'a *minor* triumph' (p. 91); while for the last novels Mr. Moser actually engages in discussion of lapses in grammar and clichés, so thoroughly by this time has the pattern been established.

If the pattern be accepted, the reader can go on to expand its applications; Captain Beard of the *Judea*, for instance, jumps his ship like Jim; but he jumps her in dock and bearing triumphantly in his arms the motherly Mrs. Beard, hence this is a good abreaction (so to speak). When Antony and Flora and Powell are in danger of being run down by another ship, there is a scene of torchlight and deadly danger that would fit very nicely into Mr. Moser's pattern, but he does not use it, being too concerned with the failure of the cabin scene to note what perhaps by his criteria would be a success. These rules of a new kind, like the neo-classic rules, will give endless scope to the critic's ingenuity; but what they do not give, in spite of Mr. Moser's qualifications, is an open approach, a free, flexible, and adaptable interpretation. There is the grid; there is the diagnosis; we have Conrad the writer on the psychiatrist's couch and can watch his unconscious betrayals. The method requires patience and a detailed knowledge, but I think that in the end the method gets control of the material.

If Mr. Moser's book were not so very good of its kind, and if it were not a kind which I think destined to increase, it would be ungracious so to labour its limitations.

Mr. Haugh says in his preface 'the intention is to explore design in Conrad ... the reader can make his own discoveries, through exposure to Conrad, of a developed sense of pattern'. Only the twelve major works, from *The Nigger* to *The Shadow Line*, are examined, largely by retelling the stories with full illustrations from the text. Mr. Haugh divides his survey into The Ship; The Shallows;

The State; his favourite character-pattern is that of the Doppelgänger (p. 40). He is perhaps aiming at the freshmen, and is without the elaborate critical apparatus of Mr. Moser, but nevertheless there is a certain family likeness. With a good deal more 'encouragement', as the blurb says, and a much simpler grid, the reader is still invited to take Conrad's measure. The critic is really in the superior position throughout of diagnosing, if not dissecting, what one cannot but regard, since the relationship is after all not a therapeutic one, as his victim rather than his subject.

M. C. BRADBROOK

On Poetry and Poets. By T. S. ELIOT. Pp. 262. London: Faber and Faber, 1957. 21*s.* net.

It is difficult for the academic critic who opens a volume of Mr. Eliot's criticism not to feel at times like the good brother of the Prodigal Son. *He* has not wasted his substance in riotous thinking. He has toiled away in his unspectacular fashion, responsible, well informed, jealous of the truth, but no one has ever thought of rewarding *him* with a fatted calf; whereas Mr. Eliot, whose criticism has sometimes been characterized by a considerable recklessness, commands an immense public, and has become in his own day a critical oracle. It will not console the academic critic to remind him that the criticism which is still read a hundred years after it was written (and Mr. Eliot's critical writings seem likely to be in that category) usually survives for qualities which are not purely critical, and for some, perhaps, that are actually uncritical. We need not repine unduly if this is so. Since literary criticism is, or should be, a civilized discussion of literature, we naturally tend to give our attention to those writers who can say things in a lively and humane fashion, who have moments of diminished responsibility when they are willing to chance their hand, and who are occasionally prepared to commit themselves to an overstatement, or to a statement that is only partially true, or true only in a special context. To be right is not necessarily to be dull; but being right about a poem or an author is apt to require so many qualifications, and such an anxious avoidance of over-simplification, that the common reader becomes bored. Mr. Eliot's criticism has often been marked by an *appearance* of hesitation and qualification, but this is perhaps more a matter of acquired technique than the expression of a mind naturally involved in scholarly doubts, or impelled by a desire to take everything into account before venturing upon a judgement. Not only has he chanced his hand, but he has sometimes trailed his coat; and from time to time, like Dryden and other lively critics, he has changed his mind, or his point of view, and has written with just as much conviction on the second occasion as on the first.

Nothing—or, at any rate, nothing very much—is here for tears. In his criticism of poetry Mr. Eliot has always tended (and here again the parallel with Dryden is obvious) to write from the point of view of the practitioner of poetry rather than that of the scholar. His sense of responsibility to living poets has therefore been more in evidence than his sense of responsibility to dead ones. In the paper called in this volume 'Milton II' (a lecture delivered to the British Academy in 1947) he indicates what the practitioner's approach to poetry implies:

> The practitioner is concerned less with the author than with the poem; and with the poem in relation to its own age. He asks: Of what *use* is the poetry of this poet to poets writing today? Is it, or can it become, a living force in English poetry still unwritten?

The critic who approaches his business in this didactic spirit is able, 'when he is the right poet talking about the right poet, to make an old masterpiece actual, give it contemporary importance, and persuade his audience that it is interesting, exciting, enjoyable, and *active*' (p. 147). That will be nice for the poet (Donne?) who happens to be the right poet. But suppose he happens to be the wrong one (Milton?), i.e. the poet who has nothing in common with the present day. Then he is of no use to contemporary writers, and may even be a bad example to the young. Eleven years earlier (in 'Milton I', 1936) the danger from Milton still seemed to Mr. Eliot acute, but he now thinks that it has passed:

> In short, it now seems to me that poets are sufficiently liberated from Milton's reputation, to approach the study of his work without danger, and with profit to their poetry and to the English language.

The curfew, then, is lifted, and Milton is once more free to walk about the streets—until, presumably, he becomes dangerous again. Isn't all this rather childish? If we must have this sort of criticism of a major English poet, could it not be sent out in a private newsletter to young poets, and marked 'confidential'?

Being a modest man Mr. Eliot has never perhaps realized that his lightest word is now apt to carry a weight of authority that he might not wish to give it. In the most recent lecture published in this volume, 'The Frontiers of Criticism' (1956), he ventures upon a series of generalizations about poetry and criticism. 'To understand a poem', he tells us (p. 115),

> comes to the same thing as to enjoy it for the right reasons. One might say that it means getting from the poem such enjoyment as it is capable of giving: to enjoy a poem under a misunderstanding as to what it is, is to enjoy it merely as a projection of our own mind.

This seems to be admirably sound doctrine. Yet two pages earlier we get this:

> The first danger is that of assuming that there must be just one interpretation of the poem as a whole, that must be right. . . . But as for the meaning of the poem as a whole, it is not exhausted by any explanation, for the meaning is what the poem means to different sensitive readers.

It would perhaps be unkind to suggest that in this second passage Mr. Eliot 'means not, but blunders round about a meaning'. Yet if we accept his dictum that 'the meaning is what the poem means to different sensitive readers', we have abandoned any belief that poetry is a form of conscious communication between poet and reader, and have accepted the view that it has the same sort of meaning as we may find in, or project into, a bank of daffodils, or the Grand Canyon, or any other non-artistic phenomenon. If that is really what Mr. Eliot believes about poetry (and he expressed a similar view in 'The Three Voices of Poetry'), then there seems to be very little need to talk about enjoying a poem 'for the right reasons'. Can there be, on his own showing, any wrong ones?

Again, he tells us that when we read the poetry of earlier centuries it is no use trying to think or feel as a contemporary of the poet would have thought or felt. Our business is rather

> to divest ourselves of the limitations of our own age, and the poet, whose work we are reading, of the limitations of *his* age, in order to get the direct experience, the immediate contact with his poetry.

One wonders what would be left of, say, *The Rape of the Lock* if one divested the poet of all that is Queen-Anne in him. This notion that poetry is some sort of essence left over when everything that is local, temporary, national, idiomatic has been allowed to evaporate is surely mistaken—and a very odd one to come from the author of *The Waste Land*.

For the rest, this volume is full of interesting criticism. Mr. Eliot has never learnt to be dull. If the criticism of individual poets in the second half of the book is in general better than the literary theory in the first half, the explanation may lie in Mr. Eliot's own assessment of himself: he has, he says, 'an incapacity for the abstruse'. He has always been at his own very high best when dealing with poetic technique—with what poets have done, rather than with what poetry is. He has also—and this is part of his attraction for his contemporaries—a considerable capacity for intolerance. The poet who turns critic is always apt to equate poetry with the kind of poetry he writes himself, and to exclude every other kind. But that, on the whole, is how literary criticism is carried on; what is contemporary is always right, until it is no longer contemporary, and it then becomes merely the expression of the thought of a past generation. Criticism, after all, is not written for posterity: if posterity reads Mr. Eliot's criticism, it will be mainly because it provides so significant a commentary on the poetry that was being written in the first half of the twentieth century.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND

The Harvest of Tragedy. By T. R. HENN. Pp. xvi+304. London: Methuen, 1956. 25*s*. net.

Dr. Henn's aim is threefold—to restate in more recent terms certain aspects in which tragedy has traditionally been viewed; to inquire into the special significance of tragic experience for the modern world; and to suggest the lines along which a synthesis with Christianity may be made. His inquiry is thus necessarily wide-ranging, and a certain diffuseness is hardly to be avoided. Any merely systematic approach, it is clear, would defeat itself. Such a book must risk being for the most part a collection of instances of tragic art, exhibited in their main bearings, and only loosely related one to another. Dr. Henn guards against this danger by providing along with discussion of particular tragic writers chapters on critical themes—as, the nature of motivation, the pleasure-pain principle, the psychology of 'catharsis', and so on. More, he does not in the end withhold a statement of his own conclusions under the third head, the relations between tragedy and Christian belief.

It is thus a light and sensible framework that underlies the whole; and there is a refreshing absence of dogmatic pronouncement throughout. Yet a general impression of inconclusiveness remains. This, of course, is not to suggest that the reader will be hot for certainties in so vast and complex an inquiry. But, too often, for all the valuable and often striking things that are said in the course of the examination, the object of inquiry seems to have disappeared from under our gaze. Part of the trouble is undoubtedly the lack of a clear terminology. As the author foresees in his introduction, 'the writer on tragedy lays himself open, at every turn, either to the charge of establishing new meanings upon an old terminology, or to losing himself in imprecision'. The problem is a very real one: but perhaps the worst of solutions would be an attempt to redress the balance of an old world of ethico-metaphysical jargon by calling in the apparently 'objective' terminology of the new, the experimental sciences. We are told at the outset that tragedy is to be examined 'not as a stable compound, but as a highly complex, composite and active substance and form'. So, too, in assessing the problems of tragic suffering,

> we are compelled to consider them from a series of viewpoints which may alternate, or come into operation simultaneously from complementary or opposing angles, in so far as we oscillate between the poles of partial identification and the objective dispassionateness of the spectator.

It is not merely that such language will be obscure to a good many readers. The writer may reply that he would be well content if the ignorant were impelled to make acquaintance with simple physical science. The real objection is that this language may convey a falsely static and mechanistic notion of the processes under review; and to this I return below.

Part of any uneasiness, too, is the very width of the survey we must embark upon. When Synge, Eliot, Lorca, and Anouilh lie between the same covers as Shakespeare, Racine, Ibsen, and Shaw, we may begin to feel that emphasis upon undoubted similarities (as writers of 'tragedy') is allowing essential difference to drop out of sight. Tragedy, indeed, comes perilously close to comprehending all serious experience; in the end, nothing less than the full Aristotelian catalogue of virtues will serve as 'a convenient method of considering the basic values (and their implied opposites) as they appear in tragedy'. The net is too coarse; if we are to make any sort of sense of tragic experience we must have a primary distinction between that which, however mightily it works upon us, remains outside the category of the 'tragic', and that which falls unmistakably within it. A third difficulty is less apparent but is perhaps more important than all. It is to be seen in a mechanistic approach to the spectator's experience of tragedy; and this, sometimes apparent in the descriptive vocabulary employed, is certainly fundamental to the synthesis which forms the third part of Dr. Henn's undertaking.

The 'peculiar quality' of tragedy, we may agree, is 'to present the mingled yarn in such a manner that a pattern is perceptible'. Dr. Henn continues:

> If that perception is accompanied by exaltation or ecstasy, by a heightening of the senses, by a transcending of the physical impact of suffering, grief, destruction,

we are enabled to recognize and to possess, at least momentarily, values that we have grounds for believing to be permanent in their own right.

It is not a trivial objection that the perception cannot truly be said to be 'accompanied by' the exaltation or ecstasy. The perception is surely inseparable from the exaltation; so that we can only say that the perception *is* the exaltation. Tragic experience is communicable only under certain conditions, rare in art and altogether absent from reality. The spectator is offered the unique combination of deep insight and perfect objectivity; and because these are mimed disasters he can for once enter into them without reservation. It is only thus that we take upon us the mystery of things. The spectator who shouts Desdemona's innocence to Othello has placed himself outside the tragic experience; he has taken upon himself not the mystery but the reality of things, a reality which must always include an observer with his disposition to intervene. In this light, the relevance of tragic experience to any truths accessible to discursive reasoning is not easy to assess. Dr. Henn follows a good many other writers in treating our experience of tragedy as a kind of evidence which is to be related to philosophical (including psychological and anthropological) notions and to the doctrines of revealed religion. But may not this be to ignore the very condition upon which we have tragic experience at all?—the remarkable paradox, unparalleled in direct experience, that we have more knowledge than the tragic sufferer but may in no way affect the course of events that leads to disaster. The grounds of any belief in 'values . . . permanent in their own right' cannot be claimed as evident in experience made possible on these unusual terms; and if we find such grounds elsewhere it remains a hazardous proceeding to relate known fiction and believed reality. Certainly, we tend to do so; and perhaps the root-cause is a failure to keep steadily in mind the nature of theatre-experience, where the individual spectator is merged not only in the make-believe of the stage, but in the communal experience of participating in it. The critical theorist who ignores this truth starts at a fatal remove from the reality: he is like that contributor to Dr. Henn's 'Symposium in the Theatre', who, finding 'the conative part' of his sensations 'cut off' (the capacity to intervene, to do something about the play's action) must sadly admit, 'I am not an actual participant but a spectator abstracted from the action and sitting securely in my theatre seat'. Perhaps we are all like that when it comes to analysing our experience. But if so, we had better realize that our theorizing starts with a large abstraction. Dr. Henn, it is abundantly evident, is very much alert to the nature of our theatre-experience; but we should consider carefully whether his method of examination and, finally, synthesis does not encourage another sort of 'heresy of paraphrase'.

To say so much is, however, to demonstrate Dr. Henn's power to fasten his reader's attention upon essentials. This is not a book to attempt at a walking-pace. It belongs, if we will use it so, to isagogic literature; its collection of instances and apt observations—always shrewd and sometimes brilliant—cannot fail to introduce the reader to the real complexity of the matters treated. We may wish to break our journey more than once or twice; a handful of the truths Dr. Henn offers will suffice for most of us to ponder. And so we think, until the

next bound is reached, and a wider country lies in view. It is, I believe, a book that will make its mark in the literature of the subject—a book to promote argument and to force the dissentient to consider well his case. Above all, it is a book that has no trace of an assumption common enough in modern criticism—that 'civilization may be saved by the values proposed by an eclectic critical taste'. Dr. Henn is a skilled and patient guide to his complex subject; and it is pleasant to add that he has been fortunate in his publisher. Three hundred pages, six full-page illustrations, and a negligible number of misprints—how long is it since the reader was so well served for twenty-five shillings?

JOHN LAWLOR

SHORT NOTICES

John Milton, Complete Poems and Major Prose. Edited by MERRITT Y. HUGHES. Pp. xx+1600. New York: Odyssey Press, 1957. $6.75.

This omnibus volume is frankly intended for undergraduate use in American universities, but it has a general value too. It supersedes Professor Hughes's well-known editions of Milton's poems in two volumes and prose selection in one volume, and in doing so it embodies both second thoughts and a great deal of new matter. Mr. Hughes has been industrious in mastering the Milton scholarship that has appeared in the interval between his two editions and has produced a volume that should be of high value to the advanced scholar of Milton as well as to the ordinary undergraduate. Here is a text of all the most important things in Milton himself, annotated with much skill and commendable brevity and furnished with apt references to the most cogent, including the latest, Milton scholarship. In putting so much within the compass of a single volume Mr. Hughes has done a first-rate service to scholarship.

E. M. W. TILLYARD

Concordance to the Poetical Works of John Dryden. Edited by GUY MONTGOMERY, assisted by MARY JACKMAN and HELEN S. AGOA. Pp. x+724. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1957. 94s. net.

This concordance, built from materials collected by the late Guy Montgomery, is a service to students of Restoration and eighteenth-century poetry. It is convenient, comprehensive, and accurate. Yet it shares the weaknesses of G. R. Noyes's edition of the poems on which it is based. Noyes modernized (and Americanized) spelling, printed a number of poems from inferior texts (e.g. *To the Lady Castlemain* and *To Etherege*), admitted some which are probably or certainly not Dryden's (e.g. The Epilogue to *The Rival Ladies* and the song, 'Blame not your *Armida*'), and held in an appendix some which have good claims to admission. The concordance, complete for Noyes's main text, ignores the appendixes. We have thus an index to the Dryden–Tate *2 Absalom and Achitophel*, but not to the Dryden–Soame *Art of Poetry*, or the important first versions of parts of the *Aeneid* published in *Sylvae*, or the verses in the prefaces (e.g. the translations of *Aen.* i. [1–6] and Horace's 'Agricolae prisci. . .'). With two critical editions of the poems in preparation, and the editors of one of these within call at Los Angeles, the compilers of this concordance would have shown a more practical respect for the selfless industry of Professor Montgomery if they had exercised a little patience. They have thrown away their opportunity.

JAMES KINSLEY

The Beautiful, the Sublime, and the Picturesque in Eighteenth-century British Aesthetic Theory. By WALTER JOHN HIPPLE, Jr. Pp. vi+390. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1957. $7.00.

This is not a history, Professor Hipple emphatically states: 'it is a philosophical survey of a series of aestheticians. . . . My interest has been in systems considered as logical structures, not in the changing tastes, suppositions, and approaches of the men who create the systems.' Most of the great names of the century are treated, but the student of literature will not be reconciled to the omission of Shaftesbury, whose original thoughts are ascribed to Addison, and of whom Hutcheson is described as only a 'half-disciple'. And Spence, surely, is of more importance than Mr. Hipple seems to assume. Nor are the critics represented—not even Dennis. The concern, then, is with philosophic notions, association, faculty psychology, and so on, and the queries relating to them. The only practising artist referred to is Hogarth, until we come to the gardeners—Repton, Uvedale Price, and Payne Knight. Intermediately we have such as Alexander Gerard, Lord Kames, Archibald Alison, Dugald Stewart handsomely ending a distinguished line. To illustrate the picturesque we are given two reproductions from William Gilpin's *Three Essays*, and two from Thomas Hearne's engravings for Payne Knight's *The Landscape*. This detailed and scholarly work will be of interest to philosophers rather than to men of letters, for whom, however, it will serve as a useful instrument to check the random observations on taste which are too often heard from those who partly know the eighteenth century.

BONAMY DOBRÉE

A Bibliographical Examination of the Earliest Editions of the Letters of Junius. By T. H. BOWYER. Pp. xxxiv+148. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1957. 250 copies.

Mr. Bowyer has well carried out his purpose of improving on the existing studies relating to the early editions of the Letters, and of providing a starting-point for further inquiries. He has given us a useful list of the letters, exactly dated from 21 January 1769 to 21 January 1772 with a full description of the collections which appeared down to 1775, together with interesting notes on such matters as the 'vellum bound set' sent to Junius by Woodfall in March 1773, and the details of the format of Wheble's edition of 1775.

All references to these collections appearing in the *Public Advertiser*, such as Junius's comments on Newbery's edition, his advertisement of the 'errata', and subsequent notices in the Reviews are included in the notes which form a useful part of each individual entry. Locations of copies described include representative libraries in England, Ireland, and the U.S.A., and we are given full information about all such copies as are of particular importance by reason of their provenance or binding or annotation. But we are warned in the Introduction that 'no attempt whatever is made to identify Junius'.

The method of description and collation is quite satisfactory, except that the contents paragraphs of Nos. 26–28 contain the title 'The Correfondence between Junius etc.' and no indication whether this does actually reproduce a misprint or not. Elsewhere we find (*sic*) used after a misprint. But my only real objection is that a bibliographical study of such excellence should have to appear in this repulsive form, a typescript reduced in size, in which italic type is indicated by underlining, and large capitals have been stuck in, in pen and ink, and a long 's' represented by a hideous hook.

Because of the general layout I find it very difficult to look up a particular item, the titles being crammed in between ruled lines; and my copy in particular caused me a good deal of trouble until I discovered that the four leaves pp. 83–90 were misbound, throwing into confusion the account of the Woodfall editions.

Surely at the University of Virginia a small edition of this kind could have been printed by hand.

HERBERT DAVIS

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL
Vol. xx, N.S. No. 1, December 1958
Yeats' 'Beast' and the Unicorn (G. Melchiori), 10–23.

ENGLISH
Vol. xii, No. 69, Autumn 1958
The Poetic Achievement of Alfred Noyes (D. Stanford), 86–88.
The Structure of *The Duchess of Malfi* (C. W. Davies), 89–93.
Realism in the Drama of Charles Reade (S. M. Smith), 94–100.
Tom Brown and Company: Scholastic Novels of the 1850s (M. M. Maison), 100–3.

ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. xxxix, No. 6, December 1958
James Eyre: Annotator (R. Quirk and L. Warburg), 241–8.
A Source for one of Ælfric's 'Catholic Homilies' (J. E. Cross), 248–51.
A Note on Gray's *Elegy* (M. Roberts), 251–6.
A Source of Yeats's *Parnell's Funeral* (P. Ure), 257–8.
Vol. xl, No. 1, February 1959
The Figure of Beowulf in the OE. Epic (G. Storms), 4–13.
Some Notes on Early Anglo-Saxon Handwriting (R. Vleeskruyer), 13–18.
The Middle English Dictionary (F. Th. Visser), 18–27.
French Influence in English Phrasing (A. A. Prins), 27–32.
Some Later Elizabethan and Early Stuart Actors and Musicians (J. G. Riewald), 33–41.
A Note on the Journals of Lodewijck Huygens [17th-century Dutch visitor to England and Wales] (A. G. H. Bachrach), 41–49.
A Note on *Beowulf*, ll. 2526b–2527a and 2295 (B. J. Timmer), 49–52.
Stansby and Jonson produce a Folio (J. Gerritsen), 52–55.
Points of Modern English Syntax (P. A. Erades), 61–64.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM
Vol. ix, No. 1, January 1959
Sense and Sensibility: An Assessment (C. Gillie), 1–9.
The Fox [D. H. Lawrence]: A Caveat (I. Gregor), 10–21.
Christopher Fry's Theatre of Words (D. Donoghue), 37–49.
Favoured Sons; The Moral World of Angus Wilson (A. O. J. Cockshut), 50–60.
Symbol and Equivalent; The Poetry of Industrialism (P. West), 61–71.
The Critical Forum: Practical Criticism, 103–6.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES
XIe Année, No. 4, octobre-décembre 1958
The Influence of Robert Garnier on some Elizabethan Tragedies (M. P. McDiarmid), 289–302.
Les Sources de *The White Devil* (F. Lagarde), 303–9.
De quelques livres récents sur Wordsworth (L. Bonnerot), 310–22.
Emily Brontë: Récentes explorations (J. Blondel), 323–30.
La Personnalité d'Hilaire Belloc et sa réputation d'écrivain (A. Bordeaux), 331–7.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY
Vol. xxii, No. 1, November 1958
The Accuracy of the Towneley Scribe (M. Stevens), 1–9.
The Origin of the Figure called 'the Vice' in Tudor Drama (F. H. Mares), 11–29.
Scarrus and the Scarred Soldier (J. L. Barroll), 31–39.
Shakespeare's Cruel Queens (T. H. McNeal), 41–50.
The Damning of Holcroft's *Knave or Not?* and O'Keeffe's *She's Eloped* (S. S. Morgan), 51–62.
New Light on the Milton-Phillips Family Relationship (R. E. Hone), 63–75.

MEDIUM ÆVUM
Vol. xxvii, No. 2, 1958
The Hero's Name in the Middle English Versions of *Lanval* (A. J. Bliss), 80–85.
A Fifteenth-Century Revision of the OF. Prose Alexander (D. J. A. Ross), 86–94.
The Late Mediæval Ballade and the Origin of Broadside Balladry (A. B. Friedman), 95–110.
'Aliri' (E. Colledge), 111–13.

MICHIGAN ALUMNUS
Vol. lxiv. No. 21, August 1958
Milton in Florence and the Florentine Baroque (J. Arthos), 289–97.
The Silences of Poetry (J. Ciardi), 298–307.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES
Vol. lxxiii, No. 8, December 1958
Tertullian and 'A Modest Proposal' (J. W. Johnson), 561–3.
Wolsey and *The Vanity of Human Wishes* (C. B. Ricks), 563–8.
Coleridge as Nehemiah Higginbottom (D. V. Erdman), 569–80.
James's *Madame de Mauves* and Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* (R. F. Gleckner), 580–6.
Edith Wharton on Critics and Criticism (E. Laguardia), 587–9.
The Protagonist of Hemingway's *The Killers* (O. Evans), 589–91.
The Grail in the *Parcevals Saga* (P. M. Mitchell), 591–4.
Vol. lxxiv, No. 1, January 1959
Periaktoi in the Old Blackfriars (W. E. Miller), 1–3.
The Sun and the Lovers in *To His Coy Mistress* (J. J. Carroll), 4–7.
Paradise Parched (F. Manley), 7–9.
Mandeville: A Popularizer of Hobbes (J. D. Young), 10–13.
Two Essays erroneously attributed to Goldsmith (M. Golden), 13–16.
Poe's Revision of *The Oval Portrait* (S. L. Gross), 16–20.
The 'Golden Branch' as a Symbol in *The House of the Seven Gables* (E. A. Havens), 20–22.
Crane's *A Mystery of Heroism*: A Possible Source (J. W. Gargano), 22–23.
Ezra Pound's Appraisal of Walt Whitman: Addendum (R. H. Pearce), 23–28.
Eliot's *Gerontion* and *As You Like It* (J. M. Major), 28–31.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW
Vol. liv, No. 1, January 1959
The Tragedie of Cleopatra and the Date of *Antony and Cleopatra* (A. M. Z. Norman), 1–9.
Shelley's Copy of Diogenes Laertius (R. R. Male and J. A. Notopoulos), 10–21.
Neo-Latin Verse: Some New Discoveries (I. D. McFarlane), 22–28.
The Name and not the Deeds [Alfred's Version of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*] (J. E. Cross), 66.
The Original of Dorset's Lampoon on Madame de Maintenon (P. Legouis), 66–68.
Coleridge on Addington's Administration (J. A. Colmer), 69–72.
Wanted—an Edition of St. Edmund's *Merure* (M. D. Legge), 72–74.

MODERN PHILOLOGY
Vol. lvi, No. 2, November 1958
Symbolism in Mediaeval Literature (M. W. Bloomfield), 73–81.
Errors concerning the Houyhnhnms (G. Sherburn), 92–97.
'Poets' Politics'—Wallace Stevens' *Owl's Clover* (J. N. Riddel), 118–32.

NEOPHILOLOGUS
43ste Jaarg., Afl. 1, januari 1959
'Hir gretteste ooth': The Prioress, St. Eligius, and, St. Godebertha (J. M. Steadman), 49–57.
Ulysses' Speech on Degree in *Troilus and Cressida* (J. Kleinstück), 58–63.
Thomas Hayward, Grammarian (V. G. Salmon), 64–74.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN
Vol. lix, No. 4, 1958
Constance in 14th-century England (N. D. Isaacs), 260–77.
Paul Greaves, Author of *Grammatica Anglicana* (N. E. Enkvist), 277–9.

NOTES AND QUERIES
Vol. v, N.S. No. 12, December 1958
Tennyson and the Sinful Queen, 507–11.
The Englishman's Library, 1839–46, 511–18.
The Elizabeth Minshull Milton Bible, 518–19.
Marvell's *To His Coy Mistress*, 521.
Short and Sweet a Play? 521–2.
Chaucer and Aristotle, 523–4.
Midsummer Night's Dream and Chapman's Homer, 524.
The Old and the New in *Much Ado*, 524–5.
The 'lute' Speech in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, 525–6.
Links with Shakespeare (XVI), 526–7.
Byblos and the *Nativity Ode*, 527–8.
Further Note on Anne Massinger and Thomas Crompton, 528.
Theophrastan Character in *Areopagitica*, 528–30.
Rowland Watkins and Andrew Marvell, 531–2.
Donne Allusion in Etherege, 532–3.
Elizabeth Drury and the Heathens, 533–4.
Donne and Ronsard, 534–6.
Wordsworth's Lucy Revisited, 538–40.
Donne's Second Anniversary, ll. 33–36, 540–1.
Apocryphal Jonsonian epigram, 543–4.
Further note on Thomas Stanley, 544–6.
Vol. vi, N.S. No. 1, January 1959
Anthony Mundy's Birth-date, 2–4.
Double, Double [Duplication of Characters' Names in Early 17th-Century Drama], 4–8.
A Dangerous Criminal Still at Large [Moriarty and *Macavity*], 8–9.
Feudal Linkage in *Beowulf*, 11–12.
James Hogg and William Blake, 12–14.

An Epigraph by Thomas Campbell, 14.
Dorothy Richardson and Bergson, 14–19.
Spenser and the 18th-Century Informal Garden, 19–21.
Sir Henry Vane the Younger, 21–24.
A Note on 'Johnie Cock', 24–26.
Wordsworth and Samuel Daniel, 26–27.
'Jalousie': Two New Datings, 27.
A New Edmund Gosse Letter, 33.
A New Thomas Hardy Letter, 34–35.
Queen Elizabeth Crowned with Stars, 35–36.
Prophetic War Novels, 36–37.
David Williams and the Image of Man as Priest, 37–39.
Unusual Words in a Diary of 1842, 40.
A Year and a Day in *The Return of the Native*, 40.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY
Vol. xxxvii, No. 3, July 1958
English Literature, 1660–1800: A Current Bibliography, 258–367.
Prince Frederick's Mask of Patriotism (W. R. Irwin), 368–84.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
Vol. lxxiii, No. 5, Part 1, December 1958
Ælfric's Grammatical Terminology (E. R. Williams), 453–62.
Medieval History, Moral Purpose, and the Structure of Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes* (R. W. Ayers), 463–74.
Politics and Poetry in Andrew Marvell (L. W. Hyman), 475–9.
Heroical Love in Dryden's Heroic Drama (S. C. Osborn), 480–90.
Birch, Johnson, and Elizabeth Carter: An Episode of 1738–39 (E. Ruhe), 491–500.
Dialectic in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (H. Bloom), 501–4.
The Elm and the Vine: Notes toward the History of a Marriage Topos (P. Demetz), 521–32.
The Browning-Rossetti Friendship: Some Unpublished Letters (A. A. Adrian), 538–44.
Whitman's Indirect Expression in *Song of Myself* (T. J. Rountree), 549–55.
The Unmistakable Stephen Crane (S. B. Greenfield), 562–72.
Vision in *To the Lighthouse* (G. Pedersen), 585–600.
Ophelia's 'Bonny Sweet Robin' (H. Morris), 601–3.

SEWANEE REVIEW
Vol. lxvi, No. 4, Autumn 1958
The Wain-Larkin Myth (J. Lehmann), 578–87.
The Substance of *Women in Love* (E. Vivas), 588–632.

Vol. lxvii, No. 1, Winter 1959
Poetry and Philosophy: Two Modes of Revelation (R. Jordan), 1–27.
Wyatt's 'They flee from me' (A. Stein), 28–44.

SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY
Vol. ix, No. 4, Autumn 1958
Measure for Measure and Lucio (W. W. Lawrence), 443–53.
Shakespeare's Early Tragic Mode (R. F. Hill), 455–69.
First Hungarian Translation of Shakespeare (T. M. Mark), 471–8.
Falstaff's Death of a Sweat (A. A. Mendilow), 479–84.
'A Table of Green Fields' (E. G. Fogel), 485–92.
Hamlet, *Antonio's Revenge*, and the *Ur-Hamlet* (J. H. Smith, L. D. Pizer, and E. K. Kaufman), 493–8.
Reputation, Oft Lost Without Deserving [Bowdler] (M. Rosenberg), 499–506.
An Early Tune for the Fool's Song in *King Lear* (P. J. Seng), 583–5.
Two Notes on *Hamlet* (III. iv. 169, v. ii. 218–36] (A. S. Cairncross), 586–8.
An Elizabethan Tiring-House Façade (R. Hosley), 588.
Two Unpublished Settings of Sonnets from *The Passionate Pilgrime* (J. P. Cutts), 588–94.
Blackstone on *Richard II* (J. C. Maxwell), 595.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY
Vol. lvi, No. 1, January 1959
Aristotle's τὸν ὅμοιον [Poetics 13.53a5] (A. H. Gilbert), 1–6.
The *Christus Domini* Concept in Mediaeval Art and Literature (Sister M. A. Klenke, O.P.), 14–25.
The Earl of Pembroke and the Youth of Shakespeare's Sonnets: An Essay in Rehabilitation (D. Taylor, Jr.), 26–54.
'The Pilot of the *Galilean* Lake' (R. E. Hone), 55–61.
Hardy's Visions of the Self (J. O. Bailey), 74–101.

TORONTO QUARTERLY
Vol. xxviii, No. 2, January 1959
Keats and the Romantic *Sehnsucht* (A. Gérard), 160–75.

VICTORIAN STUDIES
Vol. ii, No. 2, December 1958
The Literature of Chartism (Y. V. Kovalev), 117–38.
In Memoriam: The Way of a Poet (E. D. H. Johnson), 139–48.
Wiseman on the Oxford Movement: An Early Report to the Vatican (C. T. Dougherty and H. C. Welsh), 149–54.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

July—December 1958

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1958 the date of each publication.]

ALABASTER, W. Sonnets, ed. G. M. Story and H. Gardner. Oxford, 1959. pp. liv+66. 18*s*.

ATKINS, S. Goethe's Faust. Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. xiv+290. 35*s*.

BALDWIN, T. W. Studies in Honor of, ed. D. C. Allen. Urbana. pp. vi+276. $5.00.

BATE, W. J. The Stylistic Development of Keats. [Reissue.] pp. xii+214. 23*s*.

BAUM, P. F. Ten Studies in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold. Durham, N.C.; London. pp. xiv+140. 30*s*.

BLAKE, W., ed. J. Bronowski (Penguin Poets). pp. 252. 3*s*. 6*d*.

BLISS, A. J. The Metre of *Beowulf*. Oxford. pp. x+166. 25*s*.

BLUNDEN, E. War Poets 1914–1918. pp. 44. 2*s*. 6*d*.

BODELSEN, C. A. T. S. Eliot's *Four Quartets*. A Commentary. Copenhagen. pp. 128. Kr. 15.00.

BOLINGER, D. L. Interrogative Structures of American English (The Direct Question). University, Alabama, 1957. pp. viii+184.

BOYD, E. F. Byron's Don Juan. [Reissue.] pp. xii+194. 25*s*.

BRISSENDEN, R. F. Samuel Richardson. pp. 42. 2*s*. 6*d*.

BROOK, G. L. History of the English Language. pp. 224. 15*s*.

BROOKE-ROSE, C. A Grammar of Metaphor. pp. xii+344. 42*s*.

BROWNE, Sir T. Urne Buriall and The Garden of Cyrus, ed. J. Carter. Cambridge. pp. viii+120. 12*s*. 6*d*.

BULLOUGH, G. (ed.). Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Vol. II. The Comedies. pp. xiv+544. 45*s*.

BURKE, E. Correspondence, ed. T. W. Copeland. Cambridge; Chicago. Vol. I, pp. xxviii+378. 60*s*.

— A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful, ed. J. T. Boulton. pp. cxxx+198. 32*s*.

CAMPBELL, A. Old English Grammar. Oxford, 1959. pp. xvi+424. 42*s*.

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY. Shakespeare: Lectures on Five Plays. Pittsburgh. pp. xii+84. $1.00.

CAWLEY, A. C. (ed.). The Wakefield Pageants in the Towneley Cycle. Manchester. pp. xl+188. 18*s*.

CHAUCER, G. Canterbury Tales, ed. A. C. Cawley (Everyman's). pp. xviii+612. 10*s*. 6*d*.

COFFIN, C. M. John Donne and the New Philosophy. [Reissue.] New York; London. pp. xii+312. 28*s*.

COULSON, C. A. Science and the Idea of God. Cambridge. pp. vi+52. 4*s*. 6*d*.

CRAIK, T. W. The Tudor Interlude. Leicester. pp. xiv+158. 25*s*.

CRANSTON, M. John Stuart Mill. pp. 34. 2*s*.

DAHINTEN, G. Die Geisterszene in der Tragödie vor Shakespeare. Göttingen. pp. 194. DM. 16.80.

DAVIE, D. (ed.). The Late Augustans. pp. xxxvi+130. 8*s*. 6*d*.

DEKKER, T. Dramatic Works, ed. F. Bowers. Cambridge. Vol. III, pp. vi+650. 55*s*.

DONNE, J. Sermons, ed. G. R. Potter and E. M. Simpson. Vol. III, pp. x+434; Vol. IX, pp. viii+444. Berkeley; London, 1957, 1958. 56*s*. 6*d*. each.

DRYDEN, J. Poems, ed. J. Kinsley. Oxford. Vol. I, pp. xxii+466; Vol. II, pp. viii+467–1002; Vol. III, pp. vi+1003–1436; Vol. IV, pp. vi+1437–2104. 210*s*.

EARLY ENGLISH MANUSCRIPTS IN FACSIMILE. The Paris Psalter, preface coll. B. Colgrave. Copenhagen; London. pp. 20+188. £32.

EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY. The French Text of the Ancrene Riwle. Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. R. 14.7, &c., ed. W. H. Trethewey. pp. xxxiv+272. 45*s*.

— Þe Wohunge of Ure Lauerd, ed. W. M. Thompson. pp. lxiv+80. 32*s*.

EHRENPREIS, I. The Personality of Jonathan Swift. pp. 158. 15*s*.

ELLEGÅRD, A. The Readership of the Periodical Press in Mid-Victorian Britain. Göteborg, 1957. pp. 42. Kr. 8.00.

ELLIOTT, G. R. Dramatic Providence in *Macbeth*. Princeton; London. pp. xvi+234. 40*s*.

FIELDING, K. J. Charles Dickens. pp. vi+218. 15*s*.

FITZGERALD, E. Rubáiyát, ed. C. J. Weber. Waterville, Maine, 1959. p. 160. $6.25.

FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY. D. E. Mason. Music in Elizabethan England. pp. ii+38. C. R. Thompson. The English Church in the Sixteenth Century. pp. ii+58. G. E. Dawson. The Life of William Shakespeare. pp. ii+34. L. B. Wright. Shakespeare's Theatre and the Dramatic Tradition. pp. iv+ 36. V. A. LaMar. English Dress in the Age of Shakespeare. pp. ii+42. C. R. Thompson. The Bible in English 1525–1611. pp. ii+38. Washington, D.C. $0.75 each.

FREUDENSTEIN, R. Der Bestrafte Brudermord. Shakespeares 'Hamlet' auf der Wanderbühne des 17. Jahrhunderts. Hamburg. pp. 130. DM. 12.00.

FRICKER, R. Der moderne englische Roman. Göttingen. pp. 182. DM. 4.80.

GOOLDEN, P. (ed.). The Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*. Oxford. pp. xxxviii +76. 25*s*.

GUIDI, A. L'ultimo Shakespeare. Padova. pp. vi+132. L. 1,000.

— (ed.). Galvano e il Cavaliere Verde. Firenze. pp. 272. L. 900.

HASAN, M. ul. Donne's Imagery. Aligarh. pp. iv+96.

HEUSER, A. The Shaping Vision of Gerard Manley Hopkins. Oxford. pp. viii+ 128. 15*s*.

HEUSER, G. Die aktlose Dramaturgie William Shakespeares. Marburg, 1956. pp. x+430.

HOWARD, L. Herman Melville. A Biography. [Reprint.] Berkeley; London. pp. xiv+354. 17*s*. 6*d*.

HOWES, A. B. Yorick and the Critics. Sterne's Reputation in England, 1760–1868. New Haven; London. pp. xii+ 186. 36*s*.

HUMPHREY, R. Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel. [Reprint.] Berkeley; London. pp. viii+130. 10*s*. 6*d*.

JACK, I. Sir Walter Scott. pp. 40. 2*s*. 6*d*.

JOHNSON, S. Diaries, Prayers, and Annals, ed. E. L. McAdam, Jr., D. and M. Hyde (Yale Edn.). New Haven; London. pp. xxii+462. 80*s*.

KAISER, R. (ed.). Medieval English. An Old English and Middle English Anthology. [3rd edn.] Berlin. pp. xxxii+ 592. DM. 19.50.

KAYE, J. B. Bernard Shaw and the Nineteenth-Century Tradition. Norman, Oklahoma. pp. xvi+222. $4.00.

KEATS, J. Letters, 1814–1821, ed. H. E. Rollins. Cambridge. Vol. I, pp. xxii+ 442; Vol. II, pp. xiv+440. £7.

KETTON-CREMER, R. W. Thomas Gray. pp. 32. 2*s*. 6*d*.

KILLHAM, J. Tennyson and *The Princess*. pp. x+300. 35*s*.

KNIGHT, G. W. The Sovereign Flower. pp. 324. 30*s*.

LUTTRELL SOCIETY. The Strange Finding Out of Moses His Tombe, ed. C. H. Wilkinson. Oxford. pp. xii+34.

MAAS, P. Textual Criticism, tr. B. Flower. Oxford. pp. x+60. 12*s*. 6*d*.

MACLURE, M. The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534–1642. Toronto; London. pp. x+ 262. 45*s*.

MAHONEY, Mother M.D. Clarel: An Investigation of Spiritual Crisis. Washington, D.C. pp. viii+24. $0.50.

MAIRET, P. John Middleton Murry. pp. 40. 2*s*. 6*d*.

METCALFE, J. E. The Right Way to Improve your English. Kingswood, Surrey. pp. 188. 7*s*. 6*d*.

MIDDLE ENGLISH DICTIONARY, ed. H. Kurath and S. M. Kuhn. Ann Arbor; London. Part B. 4. pp. 893–1020. 21*s*.

MIDDLETON, T., and ROWLEY, W. The Changeling, ed. N. W. Bawcutt. pp. lxviii+140. 18*s*.

MILLER, J. H. Charles Dickens. The World of his Novels. Cambridge, Mass.; London, 1959. pp. xviii+346. 30*s*.

MOXON, J. Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing (1683–4), ed. H. Davis and H. Carter. pp. lxiv+480. 105*s*.

MUIR, K. (ed.). John Keats. A Reassessment. Liverpool. pp. x+182. 30*s*.

NEALE, Sir J. E. England's Elizabeth. Washington, D.C. pp. iv+20.

NOTTINGHAM MEDIAEVAL STUDIES, ed. L. Thorpe. Nottingham. Vol. II, pp. 132. 15*s*.

NOYES, R. G. The Neglected Muse. Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Tragedy in the Novel (1740–1780). Providence. pp. xii+188. $4.00.

OLDMAN, C. B., MUNFORD, W. A., NOWELL-SMITH, S. English Libraries 1800–1850. Three Lectures delivered at University College, London. pp. 78. 7*s*. 6*d*.

OSSELTON, N. E. Branded Words in English Dictionaries before Johnson. Groningen. pp. viii+192. F. 9.50.

OTSUKA, T. A Miscellany in Honour of. Studies in English Grammar and Linguistics, ed. K. Araki and others. Tokyo. pp. x+420.

OXFORD BOOK OF IRISH VERSE, XVIIth Century–XXth Century, ed. D. MacDonagh and L. Robinson. Oxford. pp. xxxviii+344. 21*s*.

PADEN, W. D. An Investigation of Gondal. New York. pp. 86. $3.00.

PARTRIDGE, E. Origins. A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English. pp. xx+970. £4. 10*s*.

PASTON LETTERS, ed. N. Davis. Oxford. pp. xxx+166. 12*s*. 6*d*.

PEARSON, H. Johnson and Boswell. The Story of their Lives. pp. viii+390. 21*s*.

POMEROY, F. M. Tristan and Iseult. An Epic Poem in Twelve Books. pp. 272. 21*s*.

POTTS, A. F. Shakespeare and *The Faerie Queene*. Ithaca, N.Y.; London, 1959. pp. xiv+270. 36*s*.

RODGERS, B. Georgian Chronicle. Mrs. Barbauld and her Family. pp. 298. 21*s*.

ROSATI, S. Il Giro della Ruota. Saggio sul 'King Lear' di Shakespeare. Firenze. pp. viii+252. L. 1,500.

ROYAL SOCIETY OF LITERATURE. Essays by Divers Hands. N.S. Vol. XXIX, ed. E. V. Rieu. pp. xii+146. 15*s*.

SELIG, E. I. The Flourishing Wreath. A Study of Thomas Carew's Poetry. New Haven; London. pp. x+186. 24*s*.

SHAKESPEARE, W. The London Shakespeare, ed. J. Munro with introd. by G. W. G. Wickham. Vol. I, pp. lxxxiv+12+678; Vol. II, pp. vi+679–1470; Vol. III, pp. viii+772; Vol. IV, pp. viii+773–1514; Vol. V, pp. viii+886; Vol. VI, pp. vi+887–1690. £7. 7*s*.

— King John, ed. J. D. Wilson, pp. iv+104. Measure for Measure, ed. Sir A. Quiller-Couch and J. D. Wilson, pp. iv+106 (Cambridge Pocket Shakespeare). Cambridge. 5*s*. each.

— The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York (Henry the Sixth, Part III) 1595. (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles 11). Oxford. pp. viii+80. 25*s*.

SHATTUCK, C. H. (ed.). Bulwer and Macready. A Chronicle of the Early Victorian Theatre. Urbana. pp. viii+278. $5.75.

SILMAN, T. Dickens. Ocherki tvorchestva. Moskva.

SØRENSEN, H. S. Word-Classes in Modern English with special reference to Proper Names, with an Introductory Theory of Grammar, Meaning and Reference. Copenhagen. pp. 190.

SPENSER, E. Works. Index to Variorum Edn., comp. C. G. Osgood. Baltimore, 1957; London. pp. x+126. 28*s*.

SPIVACK, B. Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil. New York; London. pp. xii+508. 45*s*.

SPRAT, T. History of the Royal Society, ed. J. I. Cope and H. W. Jones. St. Louis. pp. xxxiv+A–B4^{v}+440(facsimile)+ii+78.

STALLKNECHT, N. P. Strange Seas of Thought. Studies in William Wordsworth's Philosophy of Man and Nature. [2nd edn.]. pp. xiv+290. Bloomington. $5.00.

STUBELIUS, S. Airship, Aeroplane, Aircraft. Studies in the History of Terms for Aircraft in English. Göteborg. pp. xii+342. Kr. 25.00.

SUERBAUM, U. Die Lyrik der Korrespondenzen. Cowleys Bildkunst und die Tradition der englischen Renaissancedichtung. Bochum-Langendreer. pp. viii+288. DM. 25.00.

SWIFT, J. Poems, ed. H. Williams. [2nd edn.]. Oxford. Vol. I, pp. lxii+356; Vol. II, pp. xiv+357–766; Vol. III, pp. xii+767–1242. £5. 5*s*.

TAWNEY, R. H. Social History and Literature. Leicester. pp. 32. 3*s*. 6*d*.

TILANDER, G. Mélanges d'Etymologie cynégétique. Lund. pp. 332. Kr. 40.00.

TILLOTSON, G. Pope and Human Nature. Oxford. pp. viii+278. 25*s*.

TILLYARD, E. M. W. The Muse Unchained. An Intimate Account of the Revolution in English Studies at Cambridge. pp. 142. 16*s*.

— The Nature of Comedy and Shakespeare. (English Assn. Presidential Address.) pp. 16. 5*s*.

TRAHERNE, T. Centuries, Poems, and Thanksgivings, ed. H. M. Margoliouth. Oxford. Vol. I, pp. xlii+298; Vol. II, pp. x+426. 84*s*.

WARNER, O. English Maritime Writing: Hakluyt to Cook. pp. 36. 2*s*. 6*d*.

WATSON, G. (ed.). Concise Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature. Cambridge. pp. xii+272. 20*s*.

WEGELIN, C. The Image of Europe in Henry James. Dallas. pp. x+200. $4.50.

WEIMANN, R. Drama und Wirklichkeit in der Shakespearezeit. Halle (Saale). pp. 334. DM. 23.20.

WHITELOCK, D. Changing Currents in Anglo-Saxon Studies. (Inaugural Lecture.) Cambridge. pp. 32. 3*s*. 6*d*.

WHITING, G. W. Milton and this Pendant World. Austin. pp. xviii+264. $5.00.

WILD, F. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag, ed.

K. Brunner, H. Koziol, and S. Korninger. Wien-Stuttgart. pp. x+250. $7.20.

WILDE, O. The Portrait of Mr. W. H., ed. V. Holland. pp. xvi+90. 15s.

WILDER, A. W. Theology and Modern Literature. Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. xii+146. 28s.

WILSON, J. H. All the King's Ladies. Actresses of the Restoration. Chicago; London. pp. x+206. 30s.

WORDSWORTH, M. Letters 1800–1855, ed. M. E. Burton. pp. xxx+364. 42s.

WORMALD, F., and WRIGHT, C. E. (eds.). The English Library before 1700. pp. xii+274. 35s.

YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES, ed. B. White and T. S. Dorsch. Vol. XXXVII, 1956. pp. 268. 30s.

YORKSHIRE DIALECT SOCIETY. Transactions. Kendal. Part LVIII, vol. X. pp. 84. 10s. subscription.

YOUNG, R. R., FURNISS, W. T., MADSEN, W. G. Three Studies in the Renaissance: Sidney, Jonson, Milton. New Haven; London. pp. viii+284. 48s.